

APR 12 1982



IRISH BIBLICAL STUDIES

IRISH BIBLICAL STUDIES

Editor: Rev Professor E.A. Russell
 Union Theological College
 Belfast BT7 1JT

Associate Editor: Professor Ernest Best, Dept of NT.,
 The University, Glasgow, G12 8QQ

Assistant Editor: Miss Anne McConnell, Union Theological
 College, Belfast BT7 1JT, N. Ireland.

Editorial Advisory Panel

Professor David W. Gooding, Queen's University, Belfast.

Rev'd Dr. David Hill, University of Sheffield.

Principal R.J. McKelvey, The Congregational College,
College Road, Whalley Range, Manchester M16 8BP

Rev'd Professor J.S. McIvor, Union Theological College
Belfast BT7 1JT, N. Ireland

Rev'd J. Murphy-O'Connor, L'Ecole Biblique, Jerusalem

Rev'd J.S. McPolin, S.J., Milltown Park, Dublin 6.

Professor Ernest Nicholson, Oriel College, Oxford

Principal Vincent Parkin, Edgehill College, Belfast BT9 5BY

Mr David Payne, Queen's University, Belfast

Professor Jacob Weingreen, Trinity College, Dublin 2.

Subscriptions to be forwarded to the Assistant-Editor

The Journal will, normally, appear four times per year

ALL subscriptions are payable in Sterling only.

The price for 1980 will be:

Individuals: £5.50 sterling

Institutions: £6.75 sterling

Contents

Jeremy Moiser. "She was twelve years old" (Mk 5.42).A note on Jewish-Gentile controversy in Mark's Gospel	179-186
R.E.H. Uprichard, The Baptism of Jesus	187-202
A.T. Hanson, The Use of the Old Testament in the Pastoral Epistles	203-219
<u>Reviews:</u> A. Graeme Auld, Joshua, Moses and the Land (A.D.H.Mayes); Ernest Best, Following Jesus (S.Freyne); Alistair V. Campbell, Rediscovering Pastoral Care (J.R.Boyd); Francis J. Moloney, Free to Love: Poverty, Chastity and Obedience (J.R.Boyd); Karl Rahner, Theological Investigations, Vol 17; C. Butler, Theology of Vatican II (J.Thompson); M. Griffiths, Shaking the Sleeping Beauty (I.J.M.Haire); The Illustrated Bible Dictionary (E.A.Russell)	220-234
Contributors	235
Books Received	236-7

"She was twelve years old" (Mk 5.42). A Note on Jewish-Gentile Controversy in Mark's Gospel.

Jeremy Moiser

The early church was greatly preoccupied with the question of Jewish-Gentile relationships, and this preoccupation comes through clearly in the NT and later writings. /1 It is therefore highly likely, even before an examination of the text of the earliest gospel, that at some level of the tradition, perhaps even in Mark himself, the accounts of certain incidents will reflect Jewish-Gentile controversy at the time of their composition or redaction. That individual stories and episodes were used for polemical purposes is well-known; that a number of them in Mark's Gospel reflect their earlier use in polemic, or even reflect Mark's own view in the debate, should cause no astonishment. It is therefore a source of some surprise that in treatments of Mark's gospel so little attention has been paid to the question.

A convenient point of departure for such a study is the healing of Jairus' daughter, and in particular the statement that she was twelve years old: ἥν γὰρ ἑτῶν δώδεκα (no MSS discrepancies according to Soutar and Nestlé). Why does Mark include this piece of information? A glance at some of the commentaries justifies the statement at the conclusion of our opening paragraph. Many authors make no particular comment. /2 Others suggest various reasons. W. Hendriksen, for example, /3 says, "Mark probably adds this to prevent the reader from misinterpreting the term of endearment 'little girl' ". According to C.E.B. Cranfield, /4 5.42 "looks like the sort of detail that someone who was present would remember: her age may well have been mentioned at the time." H.B. Swete comments /5 that the clause "justifies ΠΕΡΙΕΠΝΑΤΕΙ- the child was of an age to walk", and in this he is followed by V. Taylor. /6 S.E. Johnson recognizes /7 that the figure may have some significance but confesses himself unable to say what it is.

In arriving at our own conclusion, we may allow ourselves to be guided by four elements in the pericope, which might at first sight be of comparatively little

significance:

- (1) Mark notes that Jairus was a synagogue-ruler (v22)
- (2) Jesus "expels" everybody apart from the parents and three disciples (v40)
- (3) Jairus' daughter was twelve years old (v42)
- (4) After the cure (or raising), Jesus told the disciples (v43) to give the girl something to eat (v43)

If the story is imagined as being addressed to Gentile converts flushed with their invitation to enter the Kingdom "ahead" of the Jews - and from what we can conclude from Mark's gospel, this is not unlikely - it might be understood as follows. The girl, who represents in her age the tribes of Israel, is laid low with a temporary illness (v23). Some think her actually dead (v35), excluded from life forever. Jesus does not intervene in that quarrel; he simply says that God will raise her up (v39). He takes her by the hand, and she rises at once and walks about (v42). Finally, Jesus offers her a place in his kingdom and give her something to eat (v43). At this, the story's readers can be expected to react only with (unjustified) astonishment (v42). This understanding does not exclude others in the mind of the pericope's editor or in that of others who had handed the story on. The latter is still related as a miracle-story with catechetical elements and details suggesting an eye-witness source. As a polemical weapon, however, it might be paraphrased thus: the Jews as a nation were "dead" because they failed to recognize their messiah. Even though few of them would turn to Jesus in faith, however, the Jews would not forgo the blessings of God's promises: they would in time be raised up and permitted to enter the kingdom. It is difficult to pinpoint the exact thrust of the pericope in its original setting. If we grant that the story is concentrated on the girl who is raised (or cured), and that in its present place it is addressed to Gentile converts, it is probably to be regarded as a caution to the over-enthusiastic Gentiles who could see no place for Judaism in the new world. On the other hand, if the story were originally related to Jews (as is probable), it could equally well serve as a warning (unless they believed in Jesus, they would not be raised from their sins) or as an encouragement (the Jews would be raised because of God's merciful salvation in Jesus). Perhaps these purposes

are not contradictory. A small complication is introduced if the expulsion of the mourners is granted symbolic significance. This will be mentioned below (no.5)

Neither Matthew (9.18-26) nor Luke (8.40-56) seems to share the outlook of Mark's account as we have interpreted it (and this in itself is instructive). Matthew calls Jairus simply ἰακώβ and omits the girl's age and Jesus' final command about food. For Matthew, the incident seems to serve a catechetical purpose: the girl represents every Christian called to new life, and she represents also the beneficiaries of Christian imposition of hands. (On the other hand, he retains Mark's detail of the length of time for which the woman with bleeding had been suffering: 9.20) While Luke calls Jairus an official of the synagogue, this seems simply to draw attention to his importance as a local dignitary. Luke retains the reference to the girl's age (8.42), but apparently only to express the more fully Jesus' compassion. The girl was an only daughter (a detail peculiar to Luke) and was moreover just nubile and in Luke's account, the order to give the girl something to eat seems to be included to emphasize the reality of the cure (cf Lk 24.41-43) and perhaps Jesus' thoughtfulness.

Our understanding of the pericope 5.21-42 is borne out by a closer consideration of other Markan episodes particularly in this and in the following section of Mark's gospel. To these we now turn.

1. After the selection of his closest disciples, whom Mark names "The Twelve" (3.16) to show his readers Jesus' intention of founding a new people of Israel to replace, or succeed to, the old one, Jesus is involved in a controversy with the doctors of the law. The argument ends with Jesus' condemnation of "slander against the Holy Spirit" (3.29), which we may interpret as the Jews' wilful refusal to accept Jesus as messiah (this must be the force of their accusation recorded in v22).

2. In the teaching in parables that follows, Mark sees it as God's intention that the Jews should misunderstand Jesus' message so that that message can be offered to Gentiles. The Jews are termed "those who are outside" (ἐκείνοι τοῖς ἔξω (ἔξωθεν) 4.11), a phrase which applies to Jews a term habitually used of unbelievers. /8 In

Mark's interpretation of the parable of the mustard-seed, it is possible that he sees in "the birds" (4.32) a reference to the Gentiles invited after all into God's Kingdom. /9

3. In the episode of the calming of the storm (4.35-41) Mark has brought out Jesus' mission to the pagans. Jesus' sleep is the symbolic repetition of his death. In the face of death he rises up. Under the frightened eyes of his disciples, Jesus' gesture prefigures the power of the risen Lord, a power of salvation even for the pagans in their sin. /10 Mark here seems to be expounding and defending the preaching of the gospel to Gentiles - a thesis defended likewise in the subsequent story of the Gerasene swine (5.1-20)

4. The pericope in 6.1-6 (unbelief in Nazareth) poses the question: why did the Jews of Mark's own time reject Jesus when so many Gentiles were becoming Christians? Mark's answer is that it is their own fault. Their own blindness and stubbornness (the refusal to accept the miracles of Jesus as signs of his messiahship) had closed their minds to God's power. He continues by describing how Jesus has to send his disciples out on a wider mission (6.7).

5. In the subsequent section of his gospel (6.7-8.33), Mark describes in particular journeys mainly outside Galilee on which Jesus was at pains to train his closest disciples. His account of the two miraculous (?) feedings, 6.30-44 (The Five Thousand) and 8.1-10 (the Four Thousand), leave the reader in no doubt that Jesus' messianic gifts were offered to, and in (representative?) part accepted by, both Jews and Gentiles. /11 (The account of the first incident, particularly 6.33 and 34, is perhaps intended to identify the crowd as the common people or as believing Jews - ἐπέγνωσαν πολλοί or ἔγνωσαν αὐτοῦς - as opposed to the leaders, μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα.) Could this be the significance also of another detail peculiar to Mark in the pericope of Jairus' daughter? We refer to the comment that Jesus allowed the girl's parents (and the three disciples) into the girl's room with him, having "expelled" or "exorcised" (ἐκβαλλών) the rest of the household. If the mourners and crowd represent those Jews who would still refuse to accept Jesus, the purpose of the

comment is to suggest that some Jews - those with sufficient faith in Jesus - are invited into the girl's bedchamber to participate in the miracle, while the rest of the people - those who "laughed at him", v40 - are excluded. /12 Of the eighteen uses of ἐκβάλλω in Mark (to include 16.17), twelve refer to the exorcism of demons (and one each to Jesus driven into the wilderness, 1.12, a leper dismissed by Jesus, 1.43, one's eye, 9.47, the temple traders, 11.15, and the son in the parable of the tenants, 12.8). It is difficult to resist the temptation to see in 5.40 an allusion to Jesus' many exorcisms, the implication being that the extirpation of unbelief is an important part of Jesus' assault on Satan. This, however, seems to lead to a tension: is Jairus's daughter thought to represent Israel as a whole or only a remnant? There may be no conflict; or possibly the story reflects two different, or at least contrasting, uses in the Jewish-Gentile polemic; or finally the construction put on ἐκβάλλω here may be too fanciful, and the girl represents quite simply the Jewish people without further qualification.

Further, the related account of the cure of the woman with bleeding (5.25-34) can be read as an expression of Jesus' attitude to ritual purity as understood in Jewish circles. He can be imagined as commenting that henceforth faith, not ritual practice, will determine membership of the Kingdom. He had no word of reproof for the desperate woman who, though unclean, touched a Rabbi (Lev 15.25ff). She had suffered for twelve years; in other words, salvation comes to her (the Jews) through faith in God's messiah, not in (vain) attempts to fulfil the law. /13

6. The incident of the blind man at Bethsaida (8.22-26) possibly functions as a symbolic account of Jesus' disciples' growth in faith, culminating in Peter's confession ("He saw everything clearly", 8.26; cf also 7.31-37 (healing of deaf man) and 11.46-52 (healing of Bartimaeus)). It could also, however, particularly in view of its juxtaposition with 8.14-21 (a warning against the leaven of the Pharisees and a reprimand for the disciples' persistent incredulity) act as a symbol of the Gentiles' coming on whom a realisation of Jesus' proper stature gradually dawns while the Jews are left in their blindness (or deafness).

7 Jesus' predictions of death and suffering (8.31;9.12, 30-32; 10.32-34) are a bitter comment on the Jews' response to his ministry (as well as a clarification of Mark's understanding of discipleship). This comment is further exemplified in 9.38-41, which mentions a man exorcizing in Jesus' name although he was not one of the Twelve. A possible intention of this pericope is to convey a reprimand to those who thought that Jews only should receive God's salvation and that no one else should benefit from messiah's powers. This interpretation, if correct, and the remark in 8.26 (Jesus' injunction to the blind man at Bethsaida) suggest that Mark's (?) thoughts on Jewish-Gentile relations have not been carried through totally.

8. In the incident of the cure of the epileptic boy immediately after the Transfiguration (9.14-29), the reference to Deut 32.5 in v19 suggests that Jesus is expressing a complaint at Israel's inability to welcome God's messiah in faith. Jesus nevertheless cures the boy because of the father's vestigial belief expressed in v22b and 24.

9. On the other hand, the section 11.12 - 14.2 seems to suggest that the exclusion of the Jews is permanent as well as culpable ("May no one ever again eat fruit from you", 11.14). This might represent one strand in early Gentile (but not Pauline) Christian thinking on the problem of the place of the Jews in God's plan. It has been incorporated into Mark's structure side by side with other material of which the Jairus' daughter story, in one of its uses, is representative.

10. Finally, it is possible that Mark wishes to record in 14.25 a vow of abstinence on Jesus' part as an act of intercession on behalf of the Jews. At the crucial moment of approaching judgement, Jesus intercedes with God for his people. /14 It is somewhat strange, however, that if this were the case, Mark does not make the matter clearer, as his words in 14.18 and 20 suggest that Jesus did partake of the meal. A possible reply might be that Mark has not understood the passage in this way and therefore is not using it polemically.

Our tentative conclusion, therefore, receives some support. It is that Mark has a message for his readers.

God did not reject the Jews, although they have merited exclusion from the church by their own conduct. Their exclusion, or at least that of the remnant, is not permanent. More importantly, the Gentiles are privileged to hear the gospel because in his own preaching Jesus had declared that his message was equally for them. At the same time there are elements in Mark's Gospel which betray a previous (or unassimilated) polemical use of the texts.

Such an understanding of Mark's Gospel also sheds light on the problem of the 'messianic secret'. The 'secret' is a device whereby Mark expresses the fact that the Jews had turned a deaf ear to Jesus' message and that therefore the Gentiles were to benefit (5.18-20). This is not necessarily to say that Mark has imposed an artificial and distorting device on the "facts". It could be that Mark sees in Jesus' (historical) prohibition to publicize his messiahship among the Jews an additional argument in defence of his own thesis. Further, it might have implications for the date and place of Mark's Gospel, or at least for some of Mark's material, /15 and also for the relationship between Mark's theology and that of Paul, to which on this point at least it seems very close.

The foregoing treatment of this potentially important question leaves more unsaid than said. The purpose of this Note, however, has not been to treat the matter exhaustively but to suggest a possible line of enquiry for someone with more competence in the field than myself.

Notes

- 1 For the purpose of this Note, it is sufficient to refer to M. Barth, Ephesians (The Anchor Bible), Doubleday, New York 1974 I, 130ff and elsewhere; J. Daniélou, The Origins of Latin Christianity (A History of Early Christian Doctrine III), Darton, Longman & Todd, London 1977, 17ff and elsewhere.
- 2 Amongst authors of the briefer commentaries, we need mention only here C.F.D. Moule, Mark (Cambridge Bible Commentary), C.U.P., London 1965, 1978, 45; A.M. Hunter, Saint Mark (Torch Bible Commentaries), SCM Press, London 1978², 66.
- 3 W. Hendriksen, Mark, The Banner of Truth Trust,

Edinburgh 1976, 214

C.E.B. Cranfield, Saint Mark, (Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary), C.U.P., London 1979², 191

H.B. Swete, Commentary on Mark, Kregel Publishers, Grand Rapids (1913), 1977, p109 - a view also found in the Gloss: Thomas Aquinas, Catena Aurea in loc (Marietta 471)

V. Taylor, The Gospel According to Saint Mark, MacMillan, London, 1966², 297

S.E. Johnson, The Gospel According to Saint Mark, (Black's NT Commentaries), London, 1977, 106

Cf 1 Cor 5.12; Col 4.5; 1 Thess 4.12

J. Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus, SCM Press, London, 1954, 79 quoting Manson (in a footnote missing in the author's Rediscovering the Parables, SCM Press, London 1966).

0. X. Léon-Dufour, Études d'Évangile, Ed. du Seuil, Paris 1965, 127-9.

1. Thus A. Richardson, The Miracle Stories of the Gospels, SCM Press, London 1948, 97-98. But cf Moule, op.cit. (N.2 above), 60

2. Note here the possible force of the Greek - they derided him, and so Jesus put them out, a nuance missing in many translations; cf 5.33 and the remarks in G. Wigram, Greek Concordance of the NT, Bagster, London 1976, App. Pt II, 11

3. Thos Aquinas had already seen, in a slightly different framework, that the woman represents the synagogue: Super Evangelium S. Matthaei Lectura, in Mt IX, 20 (Marietta 781)

4. J. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, SCM London 1977, 207-218

5. For the general problem, see e.g. R.P. Martin, Mark - Evangelist and Theologian, Paternoster Press, Exeter 1979, 51-79. Martin makes no mention of Jewish-Gentile controversy in Mark.

The Baptism of Jesus, R.E.H. Uprichard

Problems have frequently arisen over the baptism of Jesus and its significance. More recently, this has involved the historicity of the event itself. Both R. Bultmann and M. Dibelius regard the event as "myth" and "legend" and tend to see a strong reshaping of the original occurrence in the synoptic presentation. /1 The historicity, however, of the baptism of Jesus is generally accepted. The creation of an event by the early church which would cause difficulties for the sinlessness of Jesus is unlikely. Even in the early church there were difficulties over the Lord's baptism. This is evident in the Apocryphal Gospel to the Hebrews and the Gospel of the Ebionites. /2 Here the problem is of the sinless Jesus receiving a repentance baptism. The objection of John the Baptist in Mt 3.14 is hardly of this particular nature but it does reflect the same general difficulty. Traditionally the theological significance of the baptism of Jesus has been regarded as his anointing with the Spirit to the Messianic office in preparation for his public ministry. The implications, however, of this significance have scarcely been fully worked out, both in respect of the Lord's human and divine nature and to the subsequent form his life's work took. In introducing this theme, it will be convenient to approach it by means of the query as to why our Lord received John's baptism for this is the basic problem in connection with the baptism of Jesus. A number of answers have been proposed.

1. In receiving John's baptism it has been suggested that Jesus was aligning himself with John's movement without any admission of sin on his own part. So H.J. Holtzmann wrote: "He simply took his place in the movement called forth by the Baptist: there is no hint to the contrary concerning bearing sins of others, participation in the general sinfulness and the like." /3 J.A. Loisy is even more explicit: "The baptism of repentance did not render guilty those who received it without sin; a righteous man could submit to it in order to signify his intention to live purely, without confessing sins which he has not committed; he manifested his resolution to prepare himself according to his ability for the coming of the

kingdom." /4 Particularly with the eschatological emphasis in John's ministry, his baptism has been seen as more "aspiration for the future" than "regret for the past". T.W. Manson affirmed that "Jesus recognized in John's efforts to create a new Israel the purpose of God and willingly enters into it." /5

While there was an undoubted sympathy on the part of Jesus for all that John represented - evident both in Jesus' high appraisal of John and the fact that he is described as commencing his ministry in similar terms to that of John (Mt 3.2; cf 4.17) - and while part of the significance of Jesus relates to his identification with John's movement, to interpret its entire significance in this light is hardly correct. For one thing, the above hypothesis does not do justice to John's "baptism of repentance". That "repentance", even from a linguistic point of view, is now generally accepted as connoting not merely regret but a turning or conversion. /6 Hence, G.R. Beasley-Murray describes John's baptism as "a conversion baptism for the forgiveness of sins". /7 Further, it seems quite clear from the representation given to this baptism in the synoptic records, that all who came to John for baptism came on this understanding. They are precisely described in Mark as "confessing their sins" in conjunction with this baptism (Mk 1.5). Room is made for none to come other than those in this capacity. If physical descent from Abraham as a ground for self-commendation is decried by the Baptist, it is unlikely that he provided in his ranks for those to receive it "without sin".

2. Another view is that Jesus, in receiving baptism at John's hand, did actually confess his own sin. In his "Life of Jesus", Friedrich Strauss regards this as the only possible view of the matter. /8 Johannes Weiss holds a similar position: "With especial earnestness he will have made the vow of a new life, renewed faithfulness and devotion to the will of God." /9 So also Middleton Murry writes, "Whatever this man was, he was the incarnation of honesty. He would not have sought baptism for the remission of sins had he not been conscious of sin." /10

Apart from explicit apostolic statements affirming the sinlessness of Jesus, (Heb 4.15; 9.14; 1Peter 2.22; 1Jn 3.5)

it is obvious that by his words and actions during his ministry Jesus personally expressed and exhibited a unique relationship with God indicative of this sinlessness. He could challenge his opponents to convince him of sin (John 8.46). He claimed superiority over Abraham and implied eternity in his assertion (Jn 8.58). He forgave sins on his own authority (Mk 2.10) and pronounced judgment on them (Mt 11.20f). He clearly distinguished between his own relationship and that of his followers to God (Jn 20.17) and asserted categorically the evil nature of those to whom he spoke, without involving himself in their sinlessness, e.g., "...You who are evil..." (Mt 7.11). He demanded repentance of all (Mk 1.15). A. Oepke, writing specifically of the baptism of Jesus, has suggested that Christ's sinlessness in his own conscious experience was not ready made and a fixed conviction at an early date and, thus, John's repentance baptism for forgiveness presented no problem to him on this score at the time. /11 But though Jesus' conception of himself as judge and assessor of all mankind is climaxed toward the end of his ministry (Mt 10.32ff; 25.31ff), he seems to have exhibited this consciousness of a unique relationship to the divine sovereignty from the very outset of his life's work, as some of the above references indicate. There is not the slightest indication on our Lord's part of personal failure or sinfulness, and to depict the one who affirmed and acted as having a unique authority and relationship with God and who eventually assigned to himself the position of judge, as a sinner coming conscious of his own guilt to John's conversion-baptism for forgiveness, seems highly unlikely. His honesty is not to be impugned but if it were for sins he came it was for sins not his own.

An interesting variation on this theme of Christ's repentance is given by A. Plummer. He obviates the difficulty by altering the view of change or conversion involved in Jesus' repentance and by contrasting it with the common attitude of others who came to John's baptism. Of Jesus' baptism he writes: "He, like others, could bury his past beneath the waters of Jordan and rise again to a life in accordance with God's will. The change with them was from a life of sin to a life of righteousness....the change with him was from the home-life of intellectual and

spiritual development (Lk 2.52) to the life of public ministry as the Messiah." /12 This is scarcely a satisfactory explanation. It weakens the concept of change involved in John's baptism and gives it an entirely different object or purpose in Jesus' case than in that of the rest of mankind. In so doing it virtually ceases to remain a conversion-baptism for the forgiveness of sins, a feature basic to its significance. Plummer's thesis imports a Pauline theme, that of dying and rising again, certainly alien to the immediate context of Christ's baptism. While Jesus' baptism was obviously unique as compared to the others who came to John's baptism, there seems little justification for removing altogether the aspect of its relevance for the forgiveness of sins, especially in the light of John's objection to the baptism.

3. An answer to the difficulty is said to be found in Jesus' reply to John's objection recorded in Mt 3.15, "Let it be so now; it is proper (πρεπον) for us to do this to fulfil all righteousness." A. Fridrichsen suggests that the force of the πρεπον relates to the divine will and that Jesus' submission to this does not necessarily imply any degree of Messianic consciousness at that time on his part. He writes, "Here is an idea perfectly in accord with Jewish thinking: the divine will must be blindly obeyed without asking the reason for it." /13 There is a similarity between this view and that of Calvin though there would obviously be disagreement over the matter of Messianic consciousness. Calvin comments, "The word righteousness frequently signifies in Scripture the observation of the law: and in that sense we may explain the passage to mean that, since Christ had voluntarily subjected himself to the law, it was necessary that he should keep it in every part. But I prefer a more simple explanation. 'Say nothing for the present', said our Lord, 'about my rank: for the question before us is not which of us deserves to be placed above the other. Let us rather consider what our calling demands and what has been enjoined on us by God the Father'. The general reason why Christ received baptism was that he might render full obedience to the Father...." /14 On Fridrichsen's view of the passage it might be suggested that Jesus came to John's baptism without any selfconsciousness of Messiahship, simply submitting himself for the present

to what he believed was God's will for him.

As an interpretation of Jesus' reply the hypothesis is not without merit. It is consonant with a certain degree of mystery in Jesus' words to John at this point. Clearly it presupposes that Jesus had formed some conviction as to what the divine will was and its relation to John's baptism. It is not beyond the bounds of reason to regard the baptism and, particularly, the subsequent affirmation of the voice as giving a further clarification to Jesus of the divine will. But it is disadvantaged by a certain vagueness. It does not give an adequate explanation of Christ's word 'to fulfil all righteousness' which, by dint of its quite suggestive form of expression, seems to require a meaning more than simply doing what was right or what appeared to be God's will at a particular point in time. Further, the interpretation does not explain how Jesus related it to his life's vocation. It is true that Jesus may not have wished to reveal this to John at that point, but more would seem to be required of Jesus in terms of motivation than an "anonymous" conviction of the divine will. To presuppose that Messianic consciousness dawned upon Jesus for the first time as he stood in the Jordan at his baptism immediately predicates the question as to what form his consciousness of the divine will took in his mind prior to the baptism, inducing him to come to the baptism. Fridrichsen's hypothesis does not seem to answer that question satisfactorily.

4. Oscar Cullmann sees the "servant" theme as dominant in the life and teaching of Jesus. His view of the baptism of Jesus naturally evinces the same emphasis. /15 According to him, Jesus at his baptism, as the Servant of the Lord, is portrayed as consecrating himself in response to God's call and as identifying himself as Servant with the sins of the people. This is the first step on the way to the Cross, the ultimate baptism, prefigured in the Jordan baptism. His thesis develops along the following precise lines. The voice at the baptism has no relation to Psalm 2.7, it cites Isa 42.1 alone. Jesus himself said that by his baptism he would "fulfil all righteousness", by which he meant that he would effect a general forgiveness. His baptism thus points to the Cross on which he would

to achieve a general baptism for the sins of the world. For Jesus the words "to be baptized" mean to "suffer death for the people". This is clear in Jesus' use of the expression in Mk 10.38 and Lk 12.50. It is confirmed in Jn 1.29-34 where Jesus is described as the "lamb of God". John the Baptist deduced from the voice that Jesus was called to fulfil the mission of the Servant of the Lord. The root of the baptismal doctrine in Romans 6.1 and elsewhere in the NT of Christian baptism is in the baptism of Jesus.

The question as to how far our Lord was influenced by the Servant of the Lord concept has been hotly debated in NT circles. /16 There can be little doubt but that such influence was present. We need only indicate a number of the citations of Servant material by the evangelists to illustrate this: Lk 4.16f refers the preaching at Nazareth to Isa 61.1; Mt 11.5 couches Jesus' reply to John's question from prison in terms of Isa 35.5; Mt 12.18f cites Isa 42.1-4 as expressing the gentleness of Jesus' ministry; Mt 8.16f sees in Jesus' healing ministry fulfilment of Isa 53.4; Jn 12.38 quotes Isa 53 concerning Israel's unbelief. The point at issue here, however, is how far this kind of thinking was part of Jesus' motivation as he came to John's baptism or even as he left it.

Cullmann's thesis has much to commend it especially in the light of the later development of the Servant theme in our Lord's ministry. It may well be that, in the baptism of Jesus, we have the first conscious expression of this theme. But the thesis could bear modification where it postulates that the Servant motif was the dominant one and that to the virtual exclusion of others, especially the concept of the anointing of a Messianic king.

It is possible that πᾶσι may have been corrupted to τοῖς in transmission but there is little textual evidence for this and τοῖς rests on reasonably firm manuscript foundation. The theory, therefore, that the voice combines both the Servant concept of Isa 42.1 and that of the messianic king of Ps 2.7 is acceptable until proven defective. The explication of Jesus' reply, "Let it be so now; it is proper for us to do this (οὕτως) to fulfil all righteousness" (Mt 3.15) as referring to the general

forgiveness implicit in his death strains the meaning and places a rather too plenary exposition of OUTOS "to do this" - NIV; "Thus" - AV). The explanation of "being baptized" as meaning in our Lord's thought "suffering death for people" in the light of Mk 10.38 and Lk 12.50 is a most interesting feature. G.R. Beasley-Murray comments that it would be improper to read back our Lord's understanding at this later point in time to the baptism in Jordan, that it is unreasonable to attribute to Jesus at Jordan a ready-made structured plan of action based on the Servant-song and that what Jesus was referring to in Mk 10.38 and Lk 12.50 was his death, and he used baptism to refer to this and not vice-versa. /17 But as we shall see later, /18 our Lord did in fact, even at the time of his baptism, think of his baptism in Jordan as related to a baptism of ultimate suffering as a possibility. Cullmann cites John's testimony to Jesus as "lamb of God" (Jn 1.36) as further evidence of this servant theme, stressing that the Aramaic talyah can mean both "lamb" and "servant". The term "lamb of God" has been much discussed as to whether it connotes primarily the sacrificial lamb of OT thought or the triumphal ram of Apocalyptic literature. Both views are not mutually exclusive. But we note that in Jn 1.27-29 other themes are present besides the servant concept, for example, the anointing by the Spirit of one who is Son of God.

It seems quite proper to see the Servant motif as present in the records of the baptism of Jesus. Whether our Lord was conscious either before or after the baptism of being the Servant who would suffer the baptism of death is a moot point. But the linking of his baptism in Jordan with his suffering and death is a possibility. Cullmann seems to have overstressed the case by emphasizing the Servant theme to the exclusion of all others. There is no reason why it may not have been present and joined with others such as that of Messianic kingship.

5. A view similar to that of Cullmann is particularly evident in the work of W.F. Flemington which relates the baptism of Jesus to Christian baptism. /19 Flemington indicates that, for Jesus, baptism expressed and effected his oneness with the new Israel, bestowed a new experience of the Holy Spirit and witnessed to a deeper conviction of

his being the Son of God. The parallels with Christian baptism are identified from this experience as entrance into the church, the reception of the Spirit and the adoption of the believer as a son of God. These parallels are regarded as much too striking to be put aside. A number of scholars have subsequently developed this theme and traced the genesis of Christian baptism, not to our Lord's commission of Mt 28.19, but rather to his baptism in the Jordan. /20

However, the distinctions between Jesus' baptism and Christian baptism are more emphatic than the resemblances. The baptism of the Servant Messiah into solidarity with sinners can only with difficulty be related to entry of sinners into the church. The reception of the Spirit connoted for Jesus confirmation to the Messianic task, for the believer it means regeneration. The "divine adoption" in the heavenly affirmation was again to the Messianic office, for the believer it indicates the creation of a filial relationship to God. In these respects the baptism of Jesus was of a different nature from that of Christian baptism.

6. The view of Meredith G. Kline is also, in some ways, similar to that of Cullmann, though it presents its own distinctive emphasis. /21 It might be paraphrased thus: In his baptism Jesus, as covenant Servant, submitted himself to the judgment curse of God and thereby consecrated himself to his sacrificial death in the judicial ordeal of the cross. Kline's reasoning assumes the following lines: John the Baptist was the messenger of the Covenant, proclaiming not only the covenant blessing of the coming kingdom, but also the covenant curse of God's judgment on covenant-breakers. His baptism portrays a similar significance. It involves the idea of ordeal by water in a setting of God's judgment. Jesus, in submitting to it, exposes himself in symbol to the divine judgment, passes through the ordeal victoriously and hears the verdict of divine approval. Satan challenges this verdict in the temptations and the ordeal-struggle continues until Jesus' supremacy is vindicated on the cross. This view of his baptism agrees with Jesus' words in Mk 10.38 and Luke 12.50 as well as with the understanding of βαπτισμα as meaning an "overwhelming". Jesus' thought, in this respect, may

well have been structured along lines of the water-ordeal evident in the Psalms.

There can be little doubt as to the importance of the aspect of judgment in John's ministry - the Coming One would baptize with the Holy Spirit and fire. His winnowing stick would be brandished by him. The axe was already placed at the root of the tree. The religious were fleeing from an imminent judgment. This side of John's ministry has received the stress which the Gospel writers give it. It seems not unreasonable to regard John's baptism as bearing this significance also. Certainly John's words, contrasting his baptism with that of the Coming One give this impression (Mt 3.11). Fire and water not only traditionally but in OT and Qumran thought are associated together with combat ordeal. /22 To this degree Kline's thesis reads convincingly. One wonders, however, if the covenant structures, which he suggests underlie, not only John's ministry, but also that of our Lord, are as prominent as he claims. If this influence was so formative, it seems strange that its intrusions into the gospel motif are not more strongly marked. It is possible to regard the parable of the vineyard in a "non-covenantal setting" and the minimal references to the coming of Elijah hardly accord with the significance that Kline attaches to it. This highly suggestive stress on John's ministry and baptism is, nevertheless, both enlightening and stimulating.

It further makes more meaningful the view of Jesus' baptism as an "overwhelming" and as being linked with his suffering and death. The usual objection to such a meaning is the non-appearance of βαπτισμα in non-Christian writings and its absence from the LXX. /23 The idea, however, of overwhelming calamity occurs in the OT and is often associated with water. The presence in the NT of a use of βαπτίζω and βαπτισμα to denote historic ordeals (1 Cor 10.2; 1 Pet 3.21f) accords with our Lord's use in Mk 10.38 and Lk 12.50. With regard to these two sayings of our Lord, two things seem to be particularly significant.

(a) The allusion of Jesus to themes which have a direct link with John's ministry, viz., casting fire on earth (Lk 12.49; cf Mt 3.11 and Lk 3.16) and the resultant

division among mankind which this causes (Lk 12.51; cf. Mt 3.12; Lk 3.17).

(b) The association of fire and water (baptism) in Lk 12.49,50, and the reference to the cup of wrath in Mk 10.38. Fire is commonly used in the OT to express the divine judgment (Deut 32.22; Ps 21.8f; 89.46; Isa 66.15f). Fire is linked with the cup in Ps 11.6 (AV, RSV but not NIV), and fire is conjoined with flood in the idea of God's judgment in Isa 30.27,28.

Both these features open up the possibility that even at the time of his baptism our Lord thought of his death as the ultimate baptism which his baptism in the Jordan prefigured. The precise problem is, however, the time when our Lord began to think in this way. Was it at Jordan, or did he come to "review" his baptism in this light as he approached his death and came to view the event as a baptism? The strongest evidence towards an earlier consciousness consists of the links with John's ministry in Mk 10.38, Lk 12.50 and an interpretation of "fulfilling all righteousness" which suits this view. Kline's further suggestions are not convincing on this score. He argues that the background for Jesus contemplating his sufferings as a water ordeal is found in the supplicatory Psalms where the righteous servant pleads for deliverance from the overwhelming waters, e.g., Ps 69. But precise evidence of this is not available from the words of Jesus himself. Christ's reference to Jonah's trial by water as analogous to his own judgment in the heart of the earth is also noted (Jn 2.2f; cf Mt 12.39,40), but as evidence of the foregoing is somewhat tenuous.

Kline's thesis substantiates the view that Jesus ultimately came to regard his death as a baptism. It provides most suggestive structures for attributing the beginnings of such consciousness to Jesus at his baptism. It does not, however, constitute conclusive evidence of this fact.

7. G.R. Beasley-Murray and A. Richardson best express the traditional view of the baptism of Jesus as his anointing with the Spirit to the Messianic office in preparation for his public ministry. /24 Beasley-Murray's treatment is fuller and takes the following

lines: in his baptism Jesus, as Messiah and representative person, aligned himself with John's movement, received the anointing of the Spirit, demonstrated his solidarity with mankind and consecrated himself to his Father in a commission both of judgment and redemption. In this thesis the emphasis is on Jesus as Messiah, combining the idea of Servant (evident particularly in the Son of Man identification) and kingly Son of God. He is not totally aware of the implications of this in respect of death at the time of his baptism but, during his ministry and especially as he approaches death, he comes to view such death as a baptism. The ultimate to which his baptism refers is not simply his death but rather his death, resurrection, ascension and victorious establishment of his kingdom, that is, to both judgment and redemption. It is, therefore, as fallacious to see the only reference to Jesus' baptism as being to his death alone, as to portray him stepping with clear-eyed consciousness from the Jordan on the straight road to Calvary.

Alan Richardson also sees the key-feature of our Lord's baptism as anointing. That to him is what the synoptic evangelists above all indicate. "In their eyes the significance of the baptism is that it represents the anointing of Jesus with the Holy Spirit to the office and work of the Messianic Servant of the Lord." /25 Unlike Beasley-Murray, however, he defines a close and precise relationship between the baptism and the death of Christ and appears to accept that Jesus was conscious of his sin-bearing function as the sacrificial lamb even at his baptism.

The anointing of Jesus as Messiah by the Spirit as the fundamental significance of the baptism of our Lord - such a view has much to commend it. The very nature of the accounts seems to point in this direction. There is a growing objectivity about the presentation of the baptism in the synoptic records which throws emphasis on the event of the Spirit and the divine approval. Mark gives the impression that the vision and the voice were for Jesus alone (Mk 1.10). /27 Matthew alters the situation little, though he gives the voice in the third person (Mt 3.17). While Lk's version presents the divine approval, like Mark, in the second person - "You are my

Son" (Mk 1.11; Lk 3.22), the objectivity of the event is heightened by his description of the Spirit "in bodily form" (σωματικῶ εἶδελ) like a dove for all, as it were, to see. The emphasis in the synoptic presentation on the voice and the Spirit in connection with the baptism is in itself significant. It is as though the meaning of the baptism is to be understood in terms of the Spirit's descent and the divine approval. This is most prominent in the Lucan form where the baptism of Jesus is quickly mentioned as occurring after the baptism of others and the stress is on the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the praying Jesus and the affirmation of the divine approval (Lk 3.21,22).

The way in which the evangelists interpret the baptism also favours this thesis. Luke, both in his gospel (4.18) and in his choice of material in the Acts (4.27 and 10.38) may be voicing a common understanding that the baptism of Jesus was his anointing with the Spirit. /28 John's Gospel omits the actual event of the baptism but yet records the Baptist's testimony to the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus (Jn 1.32f) and insists upon Christ's abundant endowment with the Spirit (Jn 3.34)

There was clear OT precedent for messianic anointing. Kings of Israel were anointed and so became Mesiah Yahweh, the Lord's Anointed (1 Sam 16.13; Ps 89.20; 2 Kings 9.3). Priests were also anointed to their sacred office (Ex 29.7; 40.13-15; Lev 8.12; Ps 133.2). While prophets with the exception of Elisha (1 Kings 19.16) were not anointed, the Isaianic Prophet possessing the character of both king (Isa 9.6f) and priest (Isa 53.12) was anointed with the Spirit of the Lord (Isa 11.2; 42.1; 44.3; 61.1). It is hardly without significance that Jesus, on the occasion of his baptism, received the divine approval in an affirmation reminiscent of both kingly and prophetic status (Mk 1.11; Mt 3.17; Lk 3.22; cf. Ps 2.7; Isa 44.1f). It may equally be significant that, consonant with the law which required that priests had to be thirty years of age to enter office (Num 4.3,47) and be ordained by one already a priest (Ex 29.9; Num 25.13), Luke specifies John's priestly forbears (Lk 1.5,13) from which he would inherit the office and indicates, immediately after his account of our Lord's baptism and prior to listing Christ's genealogy, that Jesus

was about thirty years old when he began his ministry (Lk 3.23). /29 Could not the "fulfilling of all righteousness" be viewed in this light as complying with the divine requirement concerning messianic anointing to the office of prophet, priest and king?

The significance of this anointing for Jesus' own experience is hard to determine. The view that by it Jesus, the man, was adopted into divine sonship does not accord with other evidence substantiating our Lord's divine nature. It is difficult to determine anything in the nature of a "religious experience" which our Lord may have undergone, since the evangelists' accounts seem to be of little interest in the "experiences" of Jesus. /30 The mould in which their presentation of the event comes to us suggests rather an anointing of the Spirit, indicating a confirmation to Jesus of his Father's call and that the time was ripe for his public ministry to begin. The relationship between the texts subsequent to the baptism, portraying the Spirit's abundance on Jesus (Lk 4.18; Jn 3.24) can hardly be construed as suggesting that, without the anointing of the Spirit, he would have been powerless to begin his ministry or that his sacrificial work would have been ineffective. Rather, they seem to imply that his anointing was the seal of divine approval and that all was now ready for that work to begin, in the Spirit, so that ultimately he might offer himself in the same Spirit, with his work completed, to the Father. Confirmation with a view to initiating his public ministry and not primarily endowment of his person, seems to be the emphasis of these assertions.

Thus, in our opinion, messianic anointing was of equal importance with the Servant concept in our Lord's baptism. We might, in conclusion, review the matter as follows. In his baptism Jesus submits himself as Servant-Messiah to John's baptism. He probably does this, aware not only of John's role as forerunner but also of his own as Servant-Messiah, however slight the beginning of such consciousness. It may be that in Jesus' baptism we have the first conscious step of his ministry as Servant-Messiah, who would suffer and die for his people, a step leading eventually to the baptism of the Cross. The realisation of his death as a baptism could, however, have been a later development, a gradual awareness as his

ministry progressed.

Jesus, thus, consecrates himself to his Father in the matter of his life's work as Servant-Messiah and, at the same time, identifies himself, consistent with his view of the task, with sinful humanity. His Father responds in confirmation of the Son's act by the Spirit's descent in dove-like appearance and the voice of approbation. This appears to constitute the Spirit's "anointing" of Jesus for his public ministry, in terms of a confirmation of the divine approval and an indication that the time was ready and the divine power to hand for the work to begin. It seems correct, then, for traditional theology to regard the baptism of Jesus as his anointing by the Spirit to the Messianic offices of prophet, priest and king, to his life's work for the Father as the Father's "anointed" Son.

Notes

1. R. Bultmann, Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition³, Göttingen 1957, pp263-70; M. Dibelius, Die Formgeschichte der Evangelien, Tübingen 1971, pp270-4
2. Gospel to the Hebrews, quoted in Jerome, *Contra Pelagium* 111,2; Gospel of the Ebionites, quoted in Epiphanius, *Against Heresies*, XXX: for the texts of the Apocryphal Gospels in English, see M.R. James, The Apocryphal NT, Oxford 1924
3. H.J. Holtzmann, Die Synoptiker, Leipzig 1901, p198
4. J.A. Loisy, Les Evangiles Synoptiques, Paris 1907, p405.
5. T.W. Manson, Message and Mission of Jesus, London 1937, p441.
6. J. Behm, Art. μεταβολή, μεταβολά, TDNT, IV, Michigan 1964, p989; J. Goetzmann, Art. μεταβολά sub. Conversion, Dict.NT Theology, Ed., C. Brown, Exeter 1975, Vol 1, p357; A. Richardson, Art. "Repent", Theol. Word Book, ed. A. Richardson, London 1965, p191; J. Murray, Art. "Repentance", New Bible Dictionary, London 1962, p1083.
7. G.R. Beasley-Murray, Baptism in the NT, 2nd ed., Exeter, 1976, p48.

8. F. Strauss, Life of Jesus (ET), Bonn 1846, p352
9. J. Weiss, Die Schriften des NT, Göttingen 1907, Vol I, p70
10. J. Middleton Murry, Life of Jesus, London 1926; p31
11. A. Oepke, Art. "Baptism", TWNT, Vol I, Michigan 1964
12. A. Plummer, St. Matthew, London 1909, pp30-31
13. A. Fridrichsen, "Accomplir toute justice", Congres d'histoire du Christianisme, Jubile Alfred Loisy, I, 1928, pp169-70.
14. J. Calvin, Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists, (ET), Vol I, Edinburgh 1845, p202
15. O. Cullmann, Baptism in the NT, London 1956, pp16-22.
16. Cf. the view of M.D. Hooker, Jesus and the Servant, London 1959
17. op.cit. p76
18. See p7
19. W.F. Flemington, The NT Doctrine of Baptism, London 1964, esp. pp13-33, 43f, 91f.
20. Cf. O. Cullmann, op.cit., and D.M. Baillie, The Theology of the Sacraments, London 1957, p77
21. Meredith G. Kline, By Oath Consigned, Michigan 1975 esp. pp50-62
22. Cf. in Isa 30.27-28; and reference to the river of fire, "The Torrents of Belial" in 1 QH3, 28f
23. So G.R. Beasley-Murray, op.cit., p74
24. Beasley-Murray, op.cit., pp45-67; also A. Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the NT², London 1961, pp178-181
25. op.cit. p178
26. ibid, p181
27. Cf. C. Scobie, John the Baptist, Edinburgh 1964, esp. pp15-16, 142f; W.Wink, John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition, Cambridge 1968 partim; R.E.H. Uprichard, The Relationship of Jesus of Nazareth

and John the Baptist, Unpublished M.Th Dissertation,
The Queen's University of Belfast 1968, pp3-17

28. I.H. Marshall, The Gospel of Luke, Exeter 1978, p150
 29. J.E. Adams, Meaning and Mode of Baptism, Philadelphia 1975, pp16-20
 30. Richardson, Introduction, p178
-

The Use of the Old Testament in the Pastoral Epistles

A.T. Hanson

Anyone who writes about the Pastoral Epistles must begin by stating whether he believes they are Pauline or not, and, if not, in what circumstances he believes they were written. I state therefore at the outset that I do not regard the Pastorals as Pauline at all, in the sense that I do not believe that we have any of Paul's own writing included in them. /1 They were written, I believe, at about the end of the first century by an author who wished to claim Paul's authority for his material. He knew of certain historical details about Paul's life and he was well acquainted with most of the Pauline epistles. It is also relevant to indicate the way in which I believe the author of the Pastorals put together his material. Most of his material, I hold, is not his own. He has utilized matter from various sources, such as liturgical and credal formulae, pieces of Christian midrash, and even possible excerpts from homilies. We must therefore in analysing the author's material be careful to indicate whether it is original to him or not. He is capable sometimes as we shall be seeing, of going direct to the OT for his material, but more often his OT references come to him pre-digested, that is, already encapsulated in the material he is using. We must also seek to distinguish in the latter event whether or not the author is aware that he is quoting from Scripture. /2

V. Hasler, in his recent commentary on the Pastoral Epistles, claims that the author assumes the OT can be christianized by means of allegory, and that like Clement of Rome, he sees it "not as a document of messianic promises, but as a handbook of Christian piety". /3 This is a judgement which Hasler does not proceed to justify by means of evidence, and I hope this paper will show that it is very far from being accurate. We begin therefore with one very straightforward category of OT reference in the Pastorals, those places where the author uses material in which a reference to scripture is incorporated, without, as far as we can judge, being aware that it is a scripture reference. I can give two fairly clear instances of this, and a third which is open to dispute. The first comes from 1 Tim. 2.5. In the course of what is probably a credal formula the author writes,

εἷς καὶ μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπου, ἄνθρωπος Ἰησοῦς
 χριστός,

"And there is one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus". I have argued in my book Studies in the Pastoral Epistles /4 that this formula is based on the LXX rendering of Job 9. 32-33, in which the words μεσίτης and ἄνθρωπος occur in significant juxtaposition. It is however very unlikely that the author of the Pastorals knew this. It is much more likely that he incorporated the credal formula which he had received in his tradition without being aware that it had originally been composed by some Christian scholar who read the Book of Job in the LXX version.

A second example occurs in Titus 2.14 where we read:
 ὥς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἵνα λυτρωσῇται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ
 πάσης ἀνομίας καὶ καθαρίσῃ ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον,
 ζηλωτὴν καλῶν ἔργων.

"Who gave himself for us to redeem us from all iniquity and to purify for himself a people of his own who are zealous for good deeds." We probably have here at least two echoes of the OT. The first is the LXX of Psalm 130.8 (LXX Ps. 129.8): λυτρώσεται Ἰσραὴλ ἔκ πασῶν τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτοῦ and the second is from Exodus 19.5; Deut. 4.20; 7.6; 14.2. But once again these quotations occur in a passage which is certainly a piece of liturgical material not original to the author. Indeed I have argued in the work already referred to that it is common to 1 Peter and Ephesians as well. /5 It is most unlikely that the author was aware of the scriptural background here.

The third example is 1 Tim 3.15: in introducing a quotation from an early Christian hymn the author describes the Christian Church as στῦλος καὶ ἑδραῖωμα τῆς ἀληθείας. The phrase is to be rendered, "the pillar and foundation of the truth", not as in the RSV, "the pillar and bulwark of the truth". It is a densely packed phrase. ἑδραῖωμα is an echo of 1 Kings 9.13b, where the MT is correctly translated "a place with thee to dwell in for ever." The LXX has mistranslated this completely, but some Greek versions render it ἑδρασμα τῇ καθέδρᾳ (lit. "a seat to sit on"?). In effect, therefore, Solomon's temple is called God's

ἑδρασμα, a word closely cognate to ἑδραῖωμα here. When we find the word στυλῶς coupled with it here in 1 Timothy, we are reminded of the pillar of cloud which filled the temple after Solomon's dedication of it. /6 We have therefore an early Christian midrash on 1 Kings 8.13, in which the glory of God filling Solomon's temple is seen as a type of the glory of God in Christ filling the true temple in the new dispensation, the Christian Church. Whether the author of the Pastorals was aware of the rich scriptural background in this phrase must remain in doubt. His use of στυλῶς to mean "supporting pillar" rather than "pillar of cloud" makes one suspect that he did not see the scriptural reference.

We now turn to a second category of OT material in the Pastorals, deliberate citation by the author himself. This consists of two almost conventional citations and two others that imply more considered usage. The two conventional citations occur in 1 Tim 5.18-19:

"for the Scripture says, 'You shall not muzzle an ox when it is treading out the grain', and 'The labourer deserves his wages'. Never admit any charge against an elder except for the evidence of two or three witnesses."

The first of these comes from Deut.25.4. It is also quoted in 1 Cor 9.9, and is by this time the obvious text to quote in a context of discussion about the payment of the clergy. The text quoted in vs 19 occurs in Deut 17.6; 19.15. It is a well-known maxim in the early Church, reflected also in Matt 18.16 and 2 Cor 13.1. It is interesting that the dominical precept, found also in Matt 10.10 and Luke 10.7, is treated exactly as if it was scripture.

The other two explicit quotations occur in 2 Tim 2.19:

"But God's firm foundation stands, bearing this seal: 'The Lord knows those who are his', and 'let everyone who names the name of the Lord depart from iniquity'".

The first of these two quotations is from the LXX of Numbers 16.5: ἔγνω ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ὀντας αὐτοῦ. This is in fact an inaccurate rendering of the MT which uses the hiphil of יָדָע (know), i.e. "cause to know" and thus, instead of "The Lord knows those who are his", we have "The Lord shows (causes to know) those who are his". But the context from

which the citation is taken is very suitable from the point of view of the author of the Pastorals. He is engaged in his all-absorbing task of warning again false teachers. Numbers 16 relates the story of the revolt of Dathan and Abiram against Moses and Aaron. What could be more suitable as a text to use against false teachers, who no doubt were opposing the authority of the ordained ministry, than this one?

The second citation is more complicated. It might have been suggested by the narrative in Numbers 16, for in 16.27 Moses calls the faithful in Israel to separate themselves from the rebels. But it seems to be in its actual constituents a conflation of Isaiah 52.11 with a tag from Leviticus 24.16. Isaiah 52.11 runs thus:

"Depart, depart, go out thence;
Touch no unclean thing;
Go out from the midst of her, purify yourselves,
You who bear the vessels of the Lord".

There are several echoes of this in II Tim 2. 19-21. The LXX of the opening words is ἀπόσπλητε, ἀπόσπλητε. This is echoed in the ἀποστήτω of 2 Tim 2.19b. The reference to "Touch no unclean thing" (ἀκαθάρτου μὴ ἅπτεσθε) is taken up in 2 Tim 2.21, "If anyone purifies himself from what is ignoble" (ἐάν οὖν τις ἐκκαθάρῃ ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τούτων). And the reference to "you who bear the vessels (τὰ σκεῦη) of the Lord" is echoed in the retreatment of Paul's figure about vessels of wrath and vessels of mercy (σκεῦη) in II Tim 2. 20-21. The "naming the name of the Lord" is found in Leviticus 24.16: "He who names the name of the Lord shall surely die." It is possible that we have a deliberate reference in this passage in II Tim 2.19; the implication would be that Christians, unlike the Jews of old, can name the name of the Lord Jesus Christ with impunity, since God has fully revealed himself to them.

I do not think that the author of the Pastorals took these two quotations direct from scripture himself. I think that he found them already united in a baptismal context. If one considers them apart from their setting in II Timothy 2, it is not difficult to see how suitable they would be to a baptismal milieu. The first, "the Lord knows who are his", would emphasize the objective side of baptism, the

call and initiative of God. The second one, especially if the echo of Leviticus 24.16 is correct, would bring out the subjective side, both the responsibilities of baptism and the fact that God's revealed name has now been invoked over the newly baptized Christian. I believe that the author of the Pastorals knew of these two scriptural quotations (and knew that they were from scripture) in his baptismal tradition, and decided that they were useful to him in his struggle with false teachers. His problem is that these heretics have arisen from inside the Church; they are baptized Christians. These two quotations, combined with his transposition of the Pauline figure from Romans 9. 19-24, help him to some extent to understand God's providence in his perplexing situation: it is true that rebels and apostates can arise from the very bosom of the Church, but God will show them up and deal with them adequately. We must not conclude that baptism is therefore a useless formality: God's calling and man's response are still truly expressed by means of it. When we unravel what lies behind this passage, we come to see that the author of the Pastorals was no neophyte in the handling of scripture. /7

The third category of OT allusions takes the form of Haggada reproduced, or referred to, in the text of the pastorals. There are two such passages: 1 Tim 2.13-15 and II Tim 3.8. The first of these runs as follows:

"I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over men; she is to keep silent. For Adam was formed first, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor. Yet the woman will be saved through bearing children, if they continue in faith and love and holiness, with modesty." /8

The Greek of the words underlined is:

καὶ Ἀδὰμ οὐκ ἡπατήθη, ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἐξηπατηθεῖσα
ἐν παραβάσει γέγονεν

It is important to realize that the author of the Pastorals is here following Paul's treatment of Genesis 3. In II Corinthians 11.2-3, 14, Paul compares the Corinthian Church to a virgin espoused to Christ. He fears that the devil may have seduced them as Satan seduced Eve. Sine he refers to the propensity of the

devil to transform himself into an angel of light, he must have known the same haggadic tradition as we find in the Books of Adam and Eve, in which Satan is described as disguising himself as a radiant angel before beginning to tamper with Eve's innocence. Since Paul uses the word ῥῆξαντᾶν which can mean "seduce", it seems likely that he was familiar with the tradition that the serpent seduced Eve sexually, though that tradition is only explicitly mentioned first in extant literature in the Protevangelium Iacobi of the second century AD. /9 Paul does not draw any theological conclusions from this legend; he merely uses it as an analogy for the way in which, as he fears, the Corinthian Church is being led astray. The author of the Pastorals, on the other hand, does use it in a theological context. In the first place as Brox points out, /10 he regards the fact that Adam was created before Eve as a sign of male superiority. Here Paul would have agreed with him; see 1 Cor 11. 8-9. Next, he concludes that woman is more easily deceived than man. Here both Jewish and Hellenistic sentiment would have supported him, /11 but Paul probably would not. Paul describes Adam as having been deceived also; see Rom 7.11. Thirdly, according to the Pastorals, the original sin seems to have been sexual: this appears to be implied by 1 Tim 2.14. Here again Paul would not have agreed. According to him, the original sin was disobedience: see Rom 5.19.

Thirdly, the author of the Pastorals believes that woman can be rehabilitated by carrying out the duties of a wife and mother. That at least is how I understand v15, in agreement with Bürki, Bartsch /12, Brox and Hasler among the moderns. In this respect the author was being true to the tradition of Judaism. The Targum of Palestine on Genesis 3.16 runs: "Thou shalt bring forth sons in pain; thou shalt turn towards thy husband, and he shall have power over thee for thy justification as for thy sin." /13 The Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan likewise has "he will have rule over thee unto righteousness and unto sin". /14 The Aramaic of this last phrase ("unto righteousness and unto sin") is "חַיִּי וְחַיִּי" /15 Ginsburger gives a cross-reference to Gen 4.7, where God addressing Cain says: "And into thy hand have I delivered the power over evil passion, and unto thee shall be the inclination thereof, that thou mayest have authority over

it to become righteous or to sin. /16 Thus both these Targums agree with the author of the Pastorals that woman's duty, for good or ill, lies in domesticity and obedience to her husband. Paul would no doubt have agreed that a wife's duty was to obey her husband, but he would certainly not have admitted that woman can be saved by accepting her God-given vocation. He did not hold that we can be saved by anything we do or suffer.

This first piece of Haggada has therefore told us quite a lot about how the author of the Pastorals handles scripture. He can use Haggada, especially if it is a piece of Haggada that has already been used by his revered master Paul. But he uses it in what we can only call a crude and conventional way: he is deficient however more in his theological perception than in his ability to integrate scripture into his material.

The second piece of Haggada occurs in II Timothy 3.8, the reference to Jannes and Jambres:

As Jannes and Jambres opposed Moses,
so these men also oppose the truth

In the next verse he adds:

Their folly (ἄνομα) will be plain to all,
as was that of those two men

Jannes and Jambres are figures of Jewish legend, identified with Pharaoh's magicians who opposed Moses, as related in Exodus 8. 18-19. The earliest reference to them occurs in the Qumran documents, by which time the name of Jambres had not apparently yet been invented (it was probably originally "Mamrey", an epithet of Jambres, and meant "the opposer"). After the time of the Pastorals the legend grew luxuriantly. The Talmud furnishes us with all sorts of details about their subsequent career. /17 The author of the Pastorals is of course anxious to associate the heretics whom he is opposing with these notorious baddies.

In 3.9, the author accuses Jannes and Jambres of "folly" (ἄνομα). This may be merely a stock accusation brought against every form of heresy. But it is also possible that a passage in the Book of Wisdom throws light on the author's meaning here. The point in the scripture

narrative where the magicians of Pharaoh come off worst is in Exodus 8. 18-19, where they find themselves unable to turn the dust into gnats as Moses had done. In Wisdom 15.18-16.1 it is suggested that the plague of vermin was an appropriate punishment for Egyptians who actually worship vermin. 15.18 runs:

καὶ τὰ ζῶα τὰ ἐχθίστα σέβονται.
ἀνοίᾳ γὰρ συγκρινόμενα τῶν ἄλλων ἐστὶ χείρονα.
("The enemies of thy people worship even the most
hateful of animals,
which are worse than all others when judged by
their lack of intelligence")

It is likely that τὰ ζῶα τὰ ἐχθίστα ('the most hateful of animals') is intended to include the vermin which formed the material of some of the plagues. If this suggestion is correct, then the comment on Jannes and Jambres in the Pastorals follows on appropriately from the comment in Wisdom: the whole people of Egypt were shown up as senseless, in that they were plagued by the very creatures which they worshipped. The magicians were shown up as senseless because, having undertaken to rival Moses in wonder-working, they failed when they were unable to manufacture vermin. The application to the false teachers in the time of the Pastorals is plain enough: just as Jannes and Jambres could not compete with Moses in an exhibition of superhuman power, so the author's opponents do not possess the power of religion (τὴν δύναμιν εὐσεβείας, 3.5). Here the author has used a piece of Haggada in a fairly conventional way.

The fourth and last category into which the author's use of scripture falls is in some ways the most interesting because it seems to exhibit more originality on the part of the writer: it is the use of scripture in order to provide a structure for his narrative. I believe I can distinguish four examples of this in the Pastorals, all of which we must examine.

1. 1 Timothy 1. 14-16 and Exodus 34.6

The passage in 1 Timothy describes how God in Christ showed mercy and forbearance to Paul. In a fine phrase the author claims that Paul received mercy in order that "in me.....Jesus Christ might display his perfect

patience". If we put these two passages side by side we see a remarkable resemblance both in sentiment and vocabulary:

Exodus 34.6 (LXX)

ὁ θεὸς οἰκτίρων καὶ ἐλεήμων
μακρόθυμος
καὶ πολυέλεος
καὶ ἀληθινός

(God, compassionate and merciful,
longsuffering
and of great mercy
and true)

1 Timothy 1. 14-16

ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου
μετὰ πίστεως καὶ ἀγάπης
ἤλεήθην
τὴν ἅπασαν μακροθυμίαν

(The grace of the Lord..
..with faith and love...
I received mercy.....
..with all longsuffering

In this juxtaposition the LXX ἀληθινός could correspond to πίστεως in 1 Tim 1.14, because the Hebrew behind ἀληθινός is **יִשְׁתָּ**, a word which could as well be rendered with πίστις as with ἀλήθεια. In any case, **יִשְׁתָּ** means the reliability of God and God's reliability is implied in the πιστός λόγος of v15. Similarly ἀγάπης in 1 Tim 1.14 could very well correspond to what lies behind πολυέλεος (of great mercy) in the LXX, since the Hebrew word is **רַחֲמִים** ("mercy", "love" or "steadfast love"), the nearest equivalent in Hebrew to the great NT word "love" (ἀγάπη). /18 Thus we can find in this passage in 1 Timothy an equivalent for every phrase in the description of God's self-disclosure in Exodus 34.6. If this comparison is valid, the author of the Pastorals is boldly claiming that Christ's revelation of himself to Paul was in fact a revelation of God's own nature, akin to that which occurred on the classic occasion on Mt Sinai related in Exodus 33-34. Such a claim might seem perhaps beyond the range of the author, but we must bear in mind that one of his great constructive insights is the universality of God's love declared in Christ, an insight called forth no doubt by the exclusive tendency of the Gnostic teaching which he was opposing. I do not think it impossible that he should have deliberately modelled his account of Christ's revelation to Paul on the biblical account of God's revelation to Moses. If so, we must admit that he has proved himself here well able to handle his scriptural material in order to set forth his theology.

2. 1 Timothy 2. 3-5 and Isaiah 45. 21-22

The passage from 1 Timothy itself certainly contains a credal formula, as we have already noted, part of which may go back to Job 9.32-33. But the context in which the author places it reminds one of the LXX of Isaiah 45.21-2. The LXX is as follows:

Ἐγὼ ὁ θεὸς καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν ἐμοῦ,
δίκαιος καὶ σωτὴρ οὐκ ἔστιν πάρεξ ἐμοῦ

(I am God and there is none other apart from me,
there is none just or a saviour except me)

What these two passages have in common is an emphasis on the unity of God, a declaration of God as saviour, and a proclamation that his salvation is intended for the whole world, not for Israel only. Isaiah 45.22 continues with the words:

"Turn to me and be saved
All the ends of the earth".

And there is evidence that in Rabbinic tradition this passage in Isaiah was understood as foretelling the eventual conversion of all the Gentiles to Judaism. /19 It seems to me probable that we must attribute this use of scripture directly to the author of the Pastorals himself. Vss 3 and 4 will then be his own composition, inspired by the Isaiah passage, which had originally perhaps caught his eye because of its link with the opening clause in the credal formula in vs 4. It is in a passage such as this that the author's use of scripture shows to best advantage.

3. II Timothy 3.11 and Psalm 34.19

Dornier /20 and Hasler detect an echo of Psalm 34.19 in this passage. The Psalm reference runs as follows in the LXX, where it is Ps 33.18

ἐκέκραξαν οἱ δίκαιοι, καὶ ὁ κύριος εἰσήκουσαν αὐτῶν
καὶ ἐκ πασῶν τῶν θλίψεων αὐτῶν ἐρρύσατο αὐτούς

(The righteous cried and the Lord heard them
and delivered them from their afflictions)

This is certainly reminiscent of καὶ ἐκ πάντων με ἐρρύσατο

ὁ κύριος in II Tim 3.11b. This sentiment that the Lord rescues the righteous out of afflictions, runs like a refrain through the Psalm: see vss 6b,7b. And v21 (LXX 20) runs thus in the LXX:

πολλὰι αἱ θλίψεις τῶν δικαίων,
καὶ ἐκ πασῶν αὐτῶν ῥύσεται αὐτός.

(Many are the afflictions of the righteous
but he will deliver out of them all)

This Psalm is quoted extensively in 1 Peter 3. 10-12. There can be no doubt that this scripture reference is of the author's own devising. It may be no more than a tag. And if it has any more profound intention behind it, then the author is using the Psalms in an unpauline manner. Paul always sees Christ as the primary speaker in the Psalms, whatever secondary application there may be to those who are in Christ. The author applies the language of Psalm 34 directly to Paul. It does not seem likely that he regards the Psalm as a prophecy of Paul's career. He uses it rather as an appropriate quotation illustrating Paul's case.

4. I Timothy 4. 16-18 and Psalm 22

It was apparently Lock who first suggested that Psalm 22 lies behind this passage. /21 The suggestion is welcomed by Spicq. We can point to the following parallels:

II Tim.4. 16-18

πάντες με ἐγκατέλιπον
ὁ δὲ κύριός μοι παρέστη
καὶ ἀκούσουσιν πάντα τὰ
ἔθνη
ἔρρυσθην ἐκ στόματος λέοντος
ῥύσεται με ὁ κύριος ἀπὸ πάντος
ἔργου πονηροῦ

(All left me but the Lord
stood by me
And all the nations will hear.
I was delivered from the lion's
mouth.
The Lord will deliver me
from every evil work)

Psalm 21 (LXX)

ἵνα τί ἐγκατέλιπές με;
μὴ ἀπόστης ἀπ' ἐμοῦ
προσκυνήσουσιν ἐνώπιόν σοι
πᾶσαι αἱ πατρίαι τῆς γῆς
σῶσόν με ἐκ στόματος λέοντος
συναγωγὴ πονηρευομένων
περίεσχόν με

(Why did you leave me?
Do not depart from me
All the tribes of the earth
will worship before you
Save me from the lion's
mouth
A group of evildoers sur-
rounded me)

on the whole it seems probable that these parallels are not accidental and that the author of the Pastorals thought it appropriate that Paul's sufferings and his unfailing faith that God would rescue him ultimately should be expressed in the language of the innocent sufferer in one of the most famous psalms of suffering. If so, he has worked the scriptural phrases skilfully into his narrative. But, as in the case of the last citation, this is not Paul's technique. Paul would certainly have applied this Psalm of all others primarily to Christ. If it applied to his own sufferings at all, it would have applied to them as part of Christ's sufferings. The author of the Pastorals, who does not have Paul's deep theology of being crucified with Christ, makes the application directly.

The author of the Pastorals has actually given us his views on the various uses to which scripture can be put. It is therefore worthwhile examining the passage in which he does this, and asking ourselves how far he is true to his own principles. The passage is II Tim 3.16: "All scripture is inspired by God and profitable for teaching (πρός διδασκαλίαν), for reproof (ἐλεγμόν), for correction (ἐπανόρθωσις), and for training in righteousness (παιδείαν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ)". /22

Here we have four uses of scripture. Let us try to see how far the author has exemplified them in his own work:

διδασκαλία: This would presumably include instruction in the Christian faith. We certainly can find him using scripture in this way: his use of the two citations in II Tim 2.19 fall into this category. We suggested in our exposition of that passage that the author found the citations threw light on the nature of baptism. The piece of haggada in 1 Tim 2. 13-15 would also qualify for this description. The author finds in the Eden story useful teaching about the nature and vocation of women in God's design.

ἐλεγμός: Certainly the author is very much aware of the need for the ordained minister to exercise this function in order to ward off the attacks of heretics, though it cannot be said that he carries it out with any great subtlety or learning himself. However he would probably regard II Tim 3.19a as a form of ἐλεγμός since the citation comes from the

narrative of the rebellion against Moses, and he surely wished to associate his opponents with the rebels. In the same class would come his reference to Jannes and Jambres in II Tim 3.8. Neither example of this class could be described as a subtle or effective use of scripture, and neither could be put on the same level with Paul's brilliant and profound handling of his scriptural materials.

ἐπανόρθωσις; this is a vague category, indeed it may be merely lifted from Stoic models; /23 but probably the author would regard his treatment of the haggada about Eve in 1 Tim 2.13-15 as a suitable passage for the reformation of women's morals in the Church, especially if some of them were tending to assume too much authority.

παιδεία ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ: This most unpauline phrase could cover most activities within the Christian Church, but perhaps the most appropriate example among the scripture citations which we have reviewed are I Tim 5.18-19, II Tim 3.11 and II Tim 4.16-18. The first would give two distinct rules about the payment of ministry and the administration of discipline. The author had a liking for rules, and would welcome rules which could be supported by scripture. Both II Tim 3.11 and 4.16-18 are scriptural echoes used to adorn the account of the life of the greatly admired master Paul, and could therefore well be thought of as contributing towards training in righteousness.

Thus the author may be said to have vindicated his neat classification of the uses of scripture in II Tim 3.16. At the same time however it is interesting to note that three of his most remarkable and profound examples of using scripture do not fit into his classification at all; these are the midrash in 1 Tim 3.15 and the two passages I Tim 1.13-14 and 2.3-5, in which I have detected the author using scripture as a background to his narrative or discourse. This suggests that his list of uses of scripture in II Tim 3.16 is drawn up primarily with an eye to public usage, or usage in the context of the pastoral ministry. He does not intend to exhaust the possible ways of using scripture and he demonstrates in his own work that he can employ it more subtly and effectively than at least his way of using haggada would suggest.

As we review the author's use of scripture in his three brief letters we might begin by asking how far Hasler's scripture which we quoted at the very outset of this paper can be said to be justified. Hasler claims the author assumes that the OT can be christianized by means of allegory and that, like Clement of Rome, he sees it "not as a document of messianic promises, but as a handbook of Christian piety". We may admit indeed that the author, in common with every other writer in the NT, believes that the OT can be christianized, in the sense that he can find frequent references to Christ in it, and that he can use it as scripture in the Church. But the suggestion that he uses allegory in order to do so is quite unjustified. It may be that Hasler is confusing allegory with typology. The author of the Pastorals uses typology as in 1 Tim 3.15, where the Temple of the old dispensation is the type of the church. /24 He also uses it in II Tim 2.19, with its echoes of the rebellion of Dothan and Abiram as a type of the rebellion of the false teachers in the author's own day. But neither of these examples is verging towards allegory, as Paul's typology sometimes does. I suppose his quoting "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox...etc", in 1 Tim 5.18 could be called allegory. But it had become conventional by the author's time and in any case was borrowed from his master, Paul.

Is it true to say that the author fails to see the OT as a book of messianic promises? Hardly, in view of 1 Tim 3.15; II Tim 2.19 and I Tim 1.13-14, 2.3-5, all full of messianic interpretation. And did the author view the OT as a "handbook of Christian piety" as Clement does in his letter to the Corinthians? I think the comparison with Clement is most unfair. We have nothing in the Pastorals comparable to Clement's list of OT characters portrayed as recent, moderate Roman gentlemen; and nothing like the long quotations from Job which Clement provides. It is perhaps in his use of Haggada in I Tim 2.13-15 and II Tim 2.19 that the author of the Pastorals is most vulnerable to the accusation of using the OT as a handbook of Christian piety. Hasler has also failed to observe the passages in which the author uses scripture more profoundly, such as I Tim 3.15 and II Tim 2.19; and, probably, I Tim 1.13-14 and 2.3-5. All in all, we may surely acquit the author of the charge which Hasler brings against him.

If we look at the Pastoral Epistles in their historical context, and compare them with those parts of the NT that are nearest them in time, they do not emerge from the comparison very badly as far as the use of scripture is concerned. It is true that the author does not use scripture with the skill and theological insight of Paul, or John, or the author to the Hebrews. Nor would he perhaps have been capable of the erudite midrash on Psalm 68 which one of Paul's successors provides in Ephesians 4. 8-10. But he might be allowed to appear in the same category with the author of 1 Peter as a handler of scripture, though not, I must admit, as accomplished as he. On the other hand he is clearly superior to the author of the Epistle of James, and equally so to the writers of Jude and II Peter. He is still in touch with Jewish exegesis; he can go to the scriptures directly for his material when he chooses to; he is not in danger of lapsing into the elaborate allegorisation of the Epistle to Barnabas, and he nobly resists the temptation to hold up OT characters as models of Christian behaviour, as Clement of Rome unhappily does not. When we compare the author of the Pastorals as an expounder of scripture with Paul, we rightly conclude that he is greatly inferior. But we should compare him not with Paul but with his contemporaries and immediate successors. And when we do this we find that he was no amateur, but one who was well able to use scripture effectively enough for the purposes which he intended.

Notes

1. In this respect I have changed my view from that which I presented in my small commentary on the Pastorals (Cambridge 1966)
2. My reasons for holding this view about the nature and composition of the Pastorals are set out at length in my forthcoming commentary on the Pastoral Epistles in the New Century Bible .
3. See V. Hasler, Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus; Zuercher Bibel Kommentar (Zürich 1978), in loc. II Tim 3.15

1. Studies in the Pastoral Epistles (London 1966) 56-62
2. op.cit. 78-96
3. I have worked this out in detail in Studies in the Pastoral Epistles, 5-20
4. For a fuller discussion of this passage see Studies 29-39
5. I follow the RSV mg here, which translates the μείωσιν correctly.
6. The evidence is clearly set out in Studies, 65-77.
7. N. Brox, Die Pastoralbriefe, Regensburger NT, Vol 7 Regensburg 1969, ad loc
8. For reference see C. Spicq, Les Épîtres Pastorales Vol I, 381, Paris 1969, 4th edit
9. H. Bürki, Der Erste Brief des Paulus an Timotheus Wuppertal 1974, in loc; H-W Bartsch, Die Anfänge Urchristlichen Rechtsbildungen, Hamburg 1965, 71
10. I translate from the French rendering of R. Le Déaut, ed. Targum du Pentateuque, Vol I Genèse, Paris 1978
11. J.W. Etheridge, The Targum of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch, (New ed. NYork 1968), in loc
12. See N. Ginsburger, ed. Pseudo-Jonathan, Hildesheim and NYork 1971, 6
13. Ginsburger, op.cit. 8; the Aramaic of the last phrase is "וְהָיָה לְךָ אֶלֶף בְּרִיּוֹת"
14. For further information on this subject see H. Odeburg, art. 'Ιαννῆς, 'Ιαμβρῆς, in TWNT III, Stuttgart 1950 ed. R. Bloch, art. Note Méthologique pour l'Étude de la Littérature Rabbinique" in RSR 43 (1955) 213-224; M. McNamara, The NT and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch, Rome 1966, 85-6; K. Koch, art. Das Lamm das Aegypten Vernichtet, ZNW 57, 1966, 79-93; C. Burchard, art. "Das Lamm in der Waagschule" in ZNW 57, 1966, 219-228; also Studies, 25-28
15. I argue in my book The NT Interpretation of Scripture that the phrase πλήρης χάριτος και ἀληθείας

of John 1.14 is in fact a translation of the MT of Exodus 34.6: וַיִּסַּח יְהוָה London 1979, 97f; see also my Grace and Truth, London 1975, 14-16

19. See W.G. Braude, The Midrash on the Psalms, New Haven 1959, Vol I, 142 and Vol II, 146

20. P. Dornier, Les Épîtres Pastorales, Paris 1969

21. W. Lock, The Pastoral Epistles, ICC, Edinburgh 1924.

22. I do not think that the RSV translation of πᾶσα γραφὴ θεοπνευστος is a correct one but it does not affect the point I am making.

23. Epictetus described the Eleusinian mysteries as having been instituted for the purpose of παιδεία and ἐπ' ἀνθρώποις. See M. Dibelius, ed. H. Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe, HNT, Tübingen 1955, in loc

24. But I doubt whether he is aware of the scriptural background here.

A Graeme Auld Joshua, Moses and the Land,
T & T Clark, 1980. pp xi,144 £7.95

Perhaps the most difficult area in the OT for critical and historical study lies in the Pentateuch and early books of the deuteronomistic history, especially Joshua and Judges. This is not to underestimate the complexity of the issues facing the student of the remainder of the OT, but is intended as a comment on the number and variety of proposals made and still appearing on the earlier books, and the obvious lack of any generally recognized method by which the problems which they pose might be approached. Such problems relate both to the process of literary formation of the books and to the way in which the material they contain may be used in the attempt to understand both the history which they relate and the historical setting from which they emanated.

The book under review represents a notable attempt to bring a semblance of order to an otherwise chaotic picture through a disciplined and systematic review of major contributions from a series of scholars whose names are well-known but whose work is perhaps not generally so clearly understood or so fairly evaluated as it should be, particularly in studies which often take issue with that work.

The author supplements his review with a very detailed and highly compressed discussion of a variety of problems relating particularly to the stratification of passages at the end of Numbers and in the latter half of Joshua, dealing with the distribution of the land, and the relationship between these passages, and also to the enduring problem of the general connection between Joshua and the Pentateuch. These are issues which remain to the forefront of critical study of these books, and we must be grateful to the author for his valiant efforts to set his own proposal within the context of a discussion of mainstream biblical study.

Ernest Best, Following Jesus. Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark

JSOT, Supplement Series, No 4, Sheffield 1981
pp 283 No Price

All who are familiar with Professor Best's recent publications in the scholarly journals on the disciples / Twelve in the gospel of Mark will most certainly welcome this longer treatment of the topic. His work is always marked by thoroughness, both in his detailed examination of the Greek text and his consultation of all the pertinent secondary literature, of whatever provenance. At the same time one sees his strong theological and Christian interest coming through, something that is highlighted by the threefold division of the study under review: the Disciples and the Cross; the Disciples and the World; the Disciples and the Community.

The first is by far the longer section (pp 15-162) in which Professor Best takes us through the central section of the Gospel 8.27-10.52 with a detailed exegesis of each section. A mastery of Mark's characteristics of vocabulary, grammar and syntax makes it possible to distinguish Markan editing from pre-Markan tradition, and so a solid foundation is laid for indicating the particular highlights and overall thrust of this central theme of Markan theology - suffering discipleship in the wake of a suffering Christ. Of special significance here is the way in which Best shows this pattern present even in passages where discipleship does not seem directly in view, as for example, in the marriage and divorce passage (Mk 10.1-12). Of course this could be a dangerous exegetical principle - using a thematic approach to determine the meaning of whole sections of the work. However, Professor Best is in no danger of making that mistake as his detailed critique of Theodore Weeden's provocative, but wrong-headed book, Mark. Traditions in Conflict, (pp 237-241) makes clear. Indeed it could be said that Professor Best is over cautious in this regard, since, in his introductory chapter, he favours the view that not all that is in the Gospel can be equally labelled Markan, since the Evangelist was working under the constraint of using traditions that were not particularly suited to his purpose. More recent holistic literary approaches to the gospel would allow for a greater creativity on the part of

the Evangelist in this regard. Thus the task of separating tradition and redaction is not, therefore, as crucial as it is in Professor Best's method.

The second section of the book deals with the topic of the disciples and the world. Best discusses those texts where the missionary and apostolic character of the 'Disciples' call emerges 1.16-20; 2.14; 3.13; 6.6b-13.30; 14.28; 16.7. This reviewer cannot agree with the sharp distinction between the Twelve and the Disciples as part of the Markan scheme, as Best suggests, but this does not minimize my admiration for the detailed discussion of the relevant texts. Elsewhere I hope to discuss the matter in detail but it seems that our differing view of the matter results in part on a decision about the weight one should attribute to material Dr. Best regards as pre-Markan, and in part on the emphasis to be given to the location of various scenes within Mark's overall narrative. When viewed from this latter perspective Mark 1.16-20 e.g. portrays the ideal response to the call to repentance and the proclamation of 1.14f., and does not necessarily stand in tension with 3.13-19 etc. as a disciple passage over against a Twelve passage.

The final section deals with the disciple in community by examining the use of various ecclesial metaphors in relation to discipleship within the gospel - flock, temple, house, ship. What emerges is the fact that the call to discipleship is a call to a community of intimate knowledge and love. Yet at the same time the Markan sense of community does not seem to have been as developed or structured as that of the later gospels. But this may have been partly due to the Evangelist's inability to master his traditions totally and shape them as he would like.

It might be suggested that this admirable book represents an unfinished agenda. As already indicated Professor Best works very closely with the Greek text and his basic tools are those of grammar, vocabulary, style. The results are solid and impressive and an excellent foundation has been laid on which to build. If I suggest that the final edifice should be shaped by other tools also I hope I shall not be deemed critical of what is here accomplished. I am rather inviting Professor Best to undertake the task

of giving us a complete commentary on Mark that would replace Taylor as our standard English language text book. For such an undertaking to be successful in the current state of the discipline, concern for the overall literary features of the Markan narrative as well as greater precision in attempting to locate the work and its readership would be necessary. His mastery of all the recent Markan scholarship suggests that Professor Best is more than equal for such an agenda. The present study ensures that the essential groundwork will not have to be redone.

Trinity College,
Dublin

Sean Freyne

Alastair V. Campbell, Rediscovering Pastoral Care

Darton, Longman & Todd, 1981 ppxiii, 121 £3.95

Dr Campbell is Senior Lecturer in the Dept of Christian Ethics and Practical Theology at Edinburgh University. He has chosen his title for this book carefully because of his conviction that powerful imagery from the Bible and from the tradition of Christian care should be discovered all over again. This will counteract the weighty influence, especially in the USA, of the other human sciences, e.g. psychology and psychotherapy in the past fifty years. The author is well versed at first hand with such research and consultations as find focus in Clinical Pastoral Education and has been at the central organisation of the International Congress on pastoral care and counselling. He is known for his work in relating today's trying dilemmas in medical ethics to the theology of persons. So there will be a warm welcome for this substantial treatment, not least because there is now arising an interest in "pastoral counselling" beyond the traditional sphere of what is done by those ordained in the Church. Courses for teachers and

counsellors of the young now use this term freely.

The aim of the book is to rediscover and restore something of the biblical meaning and force of pastoral and theological terms which have been devalued, distorted and misunderstood. Pastoral care and theology cannot be divorced from all other basic theology. Whatever the merit of insights gained from human sciences we must never risk losing the distinctiveness of the resources at hand in our faith, properly understood. The writer "is concerned to restore to pastoral care a sense of indebtedness to theological insights, in an attempt to counterbalance the over-reliance in contemporary literature on the theories and terminology of psychology and psychotherapy." (p98)

The first half of the book traces three basic images of (1) the shepherd - sensitive, tender, strong and courageous in the risks essential to the role; (2) the "wounded healer", able to relate because of the shared suffering, so central a theme in understanding the Messianic kingdom's impact; (3) the "wise folly" with which the simple, devoted, loyal pastor draws so near to those needing care, while functioning in the midst of many highly skilled professionals in other fields.

Such images take us beyond the restrictive limits of logical and scientific analysis and reveal the resources we have in pastoral care, resources to be found as much in our weakness as in our strength.

The second half of the book shows how we may implement the caring which these images convey. Campbell denies that his is a "how-to-do-it" book. Nevertheless readers will benefit from what he has to say about the necessary self-knowledge required for the counsellor, about the relationship between psychiatric treatment and penitence in cases of guilt and sin; about listening with relaxation; about "the subtle rhythm of looking and looking away which amplifies and eases our verbal communication"; also about the need never to deal in a generalizing way with what must always be individual, personal, unique situations in which people meet with stress.

This is a well arranged book. Its argument is always easy to follow. It does not presume to supply lots of answers but it is bound to stir readers to reflect on the

difference between what is wrongly called "applied theology" and "pastoral theology" in the real sense of the term. It also shows that pastoral care and counseling in no way sells out to social work or theory but remains firmly rooted in a theology at once biblical and practical.

Union Theological College
Belfast

J.R. Boyd

Francis J. Moloney, Free to Love: Poverty, Chastity and Obedience

Darton Longman & Todd ppxiv,96 £2.95

"The Church needs to be questioned by the quality of life of a free and loving group of people in her midst, which sees its primary task as the continuation of the free and loving life-style of Jesus of Nazareth....biblical poverty, chastity and obedience are the vocation of every man and woman, and they are....our way to authentic humanity." That is this book in summary.

Dr Moloney met with much acclaim for his weightier work: "Disciples and Prophets: A Biblical Model for the Religious Life" (D.L. & T 1980). As a result he was much in demand among "religious families" (as he fittingly terms what are normally known as "Religious Orders"). He has been trying to explain how the members might respond to the requirement of Vatican II on the Religious Life that "the following of Christ as it is put before us in the Gospel must be taken by all institutes as the supreme rule". He believes that insufficient attention has been given publicly to this criterion for renewal. He now presents this much briefer but yet substantial treatment of the theme to engage a much larger audience in returning to the Bible sources for what have long been known as "the counsels of perfection". He sees the real issue as concerned with the "rediscovery of the person of Jesus of Nazareth, and the

etting out on a journey along his way". The classical treatises for too long led to two levels of membership in the Body of Christ, the People of God. "The Religious" were eligible with their vows to occupy the upper level of deck, whereas ordinary members had nothing more expected of them nor did they aspire to anything higher than the lower levels of faith and life. However..."the Bible will allow of no superior class of Christian." The Second Vatican Council laid it down that "all the faithful of Christ of whatever rank or status are called to the fulness of the Christian life and to the perfection of charity" (Lumen Gentium 40).

The love we receive through Jesus Christ sets us free for a loving style of living, serving and sharing. This may call for some differences in outworking in the differing situations of the religious families and in natural families and individuals. There is but one imperative that strikes home to everyone, and it is this that Dr Moloney traces through three chapters, dealing respectively with Poverty in the OT and "in Christ"; (This phrase, so widespread and searching in the NT, gives the clue to his thinking) Chastity, which he wants to be kept constantly and clearly distinct from celibacy, with which in the popular mind it is often identified, he regards as for all Christians, married or celibate. He believes that "in fact most Christians live a vowed form of chastity". He probes such passages as Matt 19.12 and 1 Cor 7.32-35. "Celibacy is a physical state; it is not a theological virtue"... "No longer is a life of chastity a 'stiff upper lip' and a 'grinding of teeth' business. Where we stand as celibates flows out of exactly the same form of experience which led that man to marry that woman: the overpowering presence of the kingdom of love." He writes most sensitively on the need for intimacy and on friendship's disciplines.

His chapter on obedience takes him to the heart of the matter. Perhaps (as in the very ancient traditions) this is the only vow needed. In the NT he finds it difficult to offer texts which provide a consistent biblical background to the practice of this vow. Yet he is driven constantly to the life-style of Jesus of Nazareth, whose life was always one of obedience to the Father and to the

Kingdom of God and his sovereignty; Jesus was poor, open to God's future; chaste, open to others in love. But both of these aspects pale into insignificance before the grandeur of his obedience. He was dominated by a profound openness toward God, whom he called Father. It is the obedience of Christ that we are each called to imitate. There is wise teaching on "superiors" and "leaders" in the light of this central fact of the Gospels. In a time of "crisis of authority" we can come more easily to understand our Lord's obedience whatever our calling in him. It is the Kingdom which claims all and empowers us all if we so allow it.

The spirit of the book is worthy of being from the pen of a teacher in the Salesian Order whose massive service in love across the world includes some half-million orphan children, and whose founder, John Bosco, spent himself in anti-clericalism in Turin, giving practical expression to reason, kindness and loving faith.

Church and society today in their great affluence need to hear the words of these "evangelical counsels" which Dr Moloney forcefully sounds in this book, so ecumenical and biblical in its handling of its themes. It would be good to find some reference to such Reformed communities as at Taizé. The author would readily say his amen to that part of the 1961 rule of Taizé which says: "The spirit of poverty is to live in the gladness of today."

Union Theological College
Belfast

J.R. Boyd

Karl Rahner, Theological Investigations, Vol 17
Darton, Longman & Todd 1981 pp260 £14.50

Christopher Butler, Theology of Vatican II (Revised and Enlarged edition)
Darton Longman & Todd, 1981 pp237 £6.95

The eminent German Roman Catholic theologian, Karl Rahner has published works on a great variety of themes in a series entitled "Theological Investigations". The latest (Vol 17) deals with Jesus, Man and the Church. In many respects it is a pity that he has not published a work of fundamental

theology treating the various themes of Christian doctrine more extensively - each in one or more volumes. As it is, each volume of "Theological Investigations" takes up various subjects in a rather piecemeal fashion. This at least has the merit of allowing the reader a brief glance at several shorter articles and themes but the disadvantage of lack of cohesion and continuity. It means also that the reviewer must select typical sections on which to comment.

In a chapter on Christology today Rahner argues persuasively for a threefold thrust. In the first place he rightly believes that the classical Christology of Chalcedon (451), despite language some find alien and incomprehensible, has an authoritative and binding character - one would have to add a "relative" authority. It points to a more primal experience of Jesus and issues a challenge to find God in Jesus Christ. In the second place, like all human statements, it portrays definite limitations - a tendency in its later expressions towards monophysitism, a failure to show the relation between Christology and Soteriology and an abstract manner of speaking about the humanity of Christ, insufficiently related to his historical experiences especially his death and resurrection. In the third place, Rahner mentions and supports new approaches to Christology today which do not deny classical orthodoxy. Emphasis is placed more on Jesus' self-giving death and victory over it; in other words (with other modern theologians - Barth, Jüngel,oltmann) crucial and central place is given to the Cross and the Resurrection in interpreting the person of Christ. This recovery of the original biblical testimony is and needs to be co-ordinated with Chalcedon so that each can interpret the other. A good balance needs to be struck between ontological and functional terminology. All in all a convincing and worthwhile essay.

Less convincing is Rahner's section on anthropology in which he points to the tendency of some modern philosophers to be taken up more with abstract structures than with man as a specific person. His concern is not simply to confront such with the Christian revelation but to point to man who in the depths of his being reaches up to God in self-transcendence. While God in the liberty of his

grace communicates himself to man to make him the centre of his concern. The height of the question about man converges on the depth of the self-communication of God. The main point, however, is whether man as sinner really does reach up in this way and whether one can so readily say with Rahner that the Christian message "means awakening and interpreting the innermost things in man, the ultimate depths of his existential dimensions". This can only be true if Rahner's premiss concerning man's question and search are valid. Many, including his own co-religionists like Kasper, query this whole approach.

It is well known that Rahner opposed Hans Küng's views on infallibility. In a chapter on "Mysterium Ecclesiae" aimed at analysing the 1973 statement from the Vatican on "What we believe", he supports the official teaching on infallibility and opposes Küng. At the same time he is critical of the statement on several scores - that it is too Roman, too little aware of modern humanism, defines infallibility too much in terms of the authority of the hierarchy and too little in terms of the whole people of God; that, in general, it is less open than Vatican II to the new theology. This tendency is also noticeable in present Papal utterances. Protestant theologians will find this chapter interesting but will question the basic presuppositions shared by the Vatican and Rahner that we can in fact affirm the infallibility of the Church as such. Of greater interest to non-Roman theology is Rahner's actual views on the unity of the Church which are considered under the title "The One Church and the Many Churches". Rahner, while not ignoring the question of truth in the doctrine of the Church, begins with sociological considerations. Here he believes he can discover that neither Protestants nor Roman Catholics at the level of practice are greatly concerned about differences of doctrine. This may prove a way forward. For example the question of justification through faith in the imputed righteousness of Christ is not one which deeply agitates the modern Christian. Nevertheless he realizes that whatever ordinary members may or may not believe the question of truth cannot be avoided. His opinion that the threefold sola of the reformers - by faith alone, by scripture alone, to the glory of God alone - can now find its place in the Roman Church, will not be shared by many, if at all by Protestant theologians. Nor will they accept that all the

ains to be done is for present-day Churches to acknowledge
t the Roman Catholic Church is their true home
eserving legitimate and full historical continuity
ween them and the Church of our beginnings". A more
alistic note is, however, struck when Rahner states that
ss unity may in fact never appear until the end of time.
we can affirm his view that as Christians "we have to do
t we can so that out of many churches the one church of
list may develop."

Rahner thus represents that wing of Roman Catholicism
ch is open to biblical theology and new insights but which
etheless goes back to reaffirm fundamental Roman dogma.

Christopher Butler's book on Vatican II is not a new
mentary but the re-issue of an old one with the addition
two chapters on "Liturgy; Church and World; Reflections",
"Retrospect and Prospect". His conclusion is that while
so-called new theology on the whole "triumphed" at
ican II the Council dealt inadequately with such subjects
ommunication in general, the mass media in particular,
personal as compared with liturgical prayer. The
wered activities of post-council Roman Catholicism (in
opinion) need the great renewal of prayer which one finds
mysticism and in some Catholic Pentecostalism. The
stitutionalism of Vatican I and the intellectualism of
ican II require an authentic witness to the mystical.
testants will ask rather whether the genuine biblical
ights which surfaced at and to some extent influenced
ican II will continue or whether the tendency towards a
traditionalism will hinder both Roman Catholic
eological development and better inter-church relations
generally today.

on Theological College
fast

J. Thompson

Michael Griffiths, Shaking the Sleeping Beauty: Arousing
The Church to its Mission

IVPress 1980

pp207 pb £1.75

The author of this practical treatment of the

present day missiological debate has been a missionary in East Asia for some twenty years, during the last part of which period he served as General Director of the Overseas Missionary Fellowship. Recently he became Principal of London Bible College. This book, which contains the substance of the author's 1978 Chavasse Lectures at Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, is a sequel to his book, Cinderella with Amnesia (IVP, 1975). In that book he tried to remind the Church ("Cinderella") sitting as she is among institutional ashes of who she really is; in this present book he challenges the Church ("Sleeping Beauty") to look at her worldwide missionary calling.

The work is divided into an Introduction and six chapters. It also contains an appendix of NT terms for Church planting, building and perfecting. In the introduction Griffiths sets the scene of the missiological debate of recent years against the background of Donald McGarron's Church Growth School. In chapter 1 he looks at the immediate goals of the worldwide Church's missionary enterprise, and in particular the issue of Church growth, seen in qualitative rather than quantitative terms. In chapter 2 he examines one of the major problems for this Church growth, "contextualization" or "de-indigenization" where the "biblical content" of Christianity should be freed or "de-indigenized" both from the sending (e.g. Anglo Saxon) and the receiving (e.g. Malaysian) cultures.

In chapter 3 Griffiths examines the question of the social involvement of the Church, arguing that the Church's social concern is justified for its own sake. Chapter 4 is a rather traditional refutation of universalism while chapter 5 looks at the means of modern mission, starting off with the variety of "charismata" or "Gnadegabe" (p148). Chapter 6 relates the Church's mission to its eschatological context and its "ultimate goal".

Here then is a popular and well-organized summary of major issues in current missiological debate, written from the standpoint of the "Lausanne Covenant" approach to missions but tempered with much English pragmatism. While concerned mainly with the Third World, what is said has wider implications. There are valuable insights e.g. our own ideas about "contextualization" as the products of our own western culture and his questioning of a national Church

the primary channel of evangelism in any country is important (pp 188-192)

Some difficulties, however, present themselves e.g. does the political content itself not come from more than one culture; is it legitimate to argue that because slavery became economic, it was not really intended to exist at all? Again, the book is marred by the implication on p125 that the World Council of Churches has given "financial aid to buy arms for bloody revolution, massacre, atrocities etc". The Indonesian term "Panca Sila" is misspelt on p24.

Overseas Office
Church House
Belfast

I.J.M. Haire

The Illustrated Bible Dictionary, Parts 1 to 3

Inter-Varsity Press 1980
pp i-xvi, 1728 £37.50

When the Inter-Varsity Fellowship published in 1962, under the Editorship of Dr J.D. Douglas, The New Bible Dictionary, it was described at the time as the major product of the Tyndale Fellowship for Biblical Research and acclaimed by the late Professor William F. Albright as "the best one-volume Bible Dictionary in the English language". By any standards the publication was remarkable value at £2.5s with its closely packed 1373 pages, 16 plates and 17 maps, and the reading public showed its appreciation by making it a best-seller over the past two decades.

Now we have "The Illustrated Bible Dictionary", bringing up-to-date the basic material of the 1962 production but extending widely the range and usefulness of the illustrations. Many of the articles remain unchanged with extensions only to the bibliography e.g. Professor F.F. Bruce's article on Acts where there is no mention within the text of the influential, if radical, commentary of Ernst

Haenchen. Some may regret this but perhaps since the main aim is to contribute to the understanding of God's Word to men from a conservative view of Scripture, this may be understandable enough. Similarly, the article on Philippians remains essentially unchanged but with important additions to the bibliography especially that of Jewett on the unity of the letter (NovT 12 1970, pp40-53). In 1962 Professor R.P. Martin had dated the Caesarean prison hypothesis as originating in 1731 which he now corrects to 1799. Sometimes the original writer gives way to someone more involved in a particular field e.g. that on 1,2 Corinthians by A.F. Walls, a historian, is replaced by a New scholar, Dr R.D. de Lacey of London Bible College (who echoes the view that the reputation for vice of every kind given to Corinth was foisted on old Corinth by her trading-rival, Athens). The article on the Cross by J.B. Torrance of Aberdeen University incorporates information from an archaeological discovery in 1968 of an ossuary containing the only extant bones of a crucified man, dated between AD7 and AD66, which indicate that the arms, not the hands, were nailed to the cross-beam and both legs pinned by a single nail. One slight change is noted in the article on John's Gospel by I.H. Marshall where he concedes that the use of sources is probable and that the Gospel went through several stages of composition. We note, too, that the error in the first article is continued in the new Dictionary where, instead of pericope de adultera we haveadulteria (Part II, 802).

It is difficult in a limited review to do justice to the valuable illustrations without falling into the jargon of a publisher's blurb, but there is no doubt that in the area of illustration, this Dictionary is by far the best known to the reviewer. We can give some examples of the kind of improvements made: The information given on Accad is identical with that in the NBD but the IBD adds an illustration of a sandstone stele of Agade. The bronze head, formerly given in black and white, is now in colour. In addition, there is a coloured map, showing the two possible sites of Accad. An additional five illustrations improve the effectiveness of the article on Agriculture, viz, a wooden tomb-model of an Egyptian granary, a wooden sledge for threshing, a water-sweep for irrigation and two coloured illustrations of the Egyptian harvesting scene. No

alteration has been made to the content of the article on Alexandria but there is a larger plan in colour of the city gathered from literary sources and a colour illustration of the pillar erected at Alexandria by the Roman Prefect, Pompey. Notable articles include those on Archaeology, Architecture, the Nabataeans and Texts and Versions, on Herbs and Spices (with colour photos of bitter aloe, rock rose, mint, myrrh, rue, coriander, dill, henna) but it is difficult to select where the standard throughout is so consistent. While many distinguished scholars are involved in the production, particular mention should be made of the contribution of Professor D.J. Wiseman of the University of London whose archaeological excavations have added greatly to the value of the Dictionary, bringing it up-to-date in so many areas.

Occasionally we come across perplexing statements e.g. a virtual claim to deity is imbedded in the most undoubted sayings of the historical Jesus, as imbedded in the Synoptic Gospels.....in virtue of his deity he was able to defeat and dispossess the devil" (Part II, 687,688; art. on "Incarnation" by J.I. Packer). How does this square up with what Jesus says in Q: "If I by the Spirit of God cast out demons..." and how far does it endanger the humanity of Jesus? Sometimes there are unexpected omissions e.g. the name of G.B. Caird from the bibliography on "Revelation" or commentaries later than 1957 for Romans.

All in all, however, The Illustrated Bible Dictionary is an outstanding contribution for those who seek "to reach a deeper understanding of the Bible and a richer appreciation of its message". It will be invaluable to layman, theological student or minister who look for a first-class reference book. We congratulate the Inter-Varsity Press on this outstanding production.

Union Theological College
Belfast

E.A. Russell

Contributors

Professor A.T.Hanson is Professor of Biblical Studies in the University of Hull and the author of a number of books including "The Pioneer Ministry", "Studies in the Pastoral Epistles" (1966), "Studies in Paul's Technique & Theology" (1974) and "Grace and Truth" (1975); also of numerous reviews and articles.

Dr Jeremy Moser is a Teacher in Religious Education at Truro School, Sometime Lecturer in Systematic Theology in a Roman Catholic theological college, author of articles in The Way, New Blackfriars, The Thomist, The Scottish Journal of Theology, Irish Theological College and The Downside Review; freelance translator of theological and philosophical works including works by Rahner, Pannenberg, Boecker and Delumeau.

The Rev Dr R.H.E. Uprichard is Presbyterian Minister of Trinity Church, Ahoghill, N. Ireland, Sometime Lecturer in Biblical Studies Certificate at The Queen's University of Belfast where he graduated in Honours History and in Divinity and took his Master of Theology and Doctor of Philosophy degrees.

Books received

arton, Longman & Todd

- John Coventry, SJ, Faith in Jesus Christ, 1980 pb
pp56 £1.50
- Alan Ecclestone, The Night Sky of the Lord, 1980 pb
pp232 £4.50
- Gerald J Hughes, SJ, Moral Decisions, 1980 pb
pp60 £1.50
- David Parry, OSB, Households of God, The Rule of St.
Benedict, with explanations for monks and
lay-people today, 1980 pb pp199 £4.50

Inter-Varsity Press

- F. Balchin, Let the Bible Speak, 1981 pb pp96 £1.25
- Maurice C. Burrell, The Challenge of the Cults, 1981 pb
pp150 £1.60
- Don Elsdon, Bent World, Science, the Bible and the
Environment, 1981 pb pp170 £2.95
- Michael Griffiths, Shaking the Sleeping Beauty, 1980 pb
pp207 £1.75
- H. Marshall, Acts, Introduction and Commentary, 1980 pb
pp427 £5.50
- Charles Martin, You've got to start Somewhere when you think
about Education, 1979 pb pp127 £1.35

Saint Andrews Press

- John Baker, The Prophetic Line, The Genius of Hebrew
Religion, 1980 pb pp137 No price
- F. Glasson, Jesus and the End of the World, 1980 pb
pp145 £2.50
- A.M. Hunter, Christ and the Kingdom, 1980 pb pp110 £1.95
- James Martin, People in the Jesus Story, 1980 pb pp94
£1.50
- Ralph Morton, Knowing Man, 1980 pb pp170 £2.50

- Geoffrey W. Bromiley, God and Marriage, 1981 pb
T & T Clark pp88 £1.95
- Peter Matheson, The Third Reich and the Christian Churches, 1981 pb
T & T Clark pp103 £2.95
- Stephen Clark, Man and Woman in Christ, 1980
T & T Clark pp753 £7.95
- James D. Smart, The Past, Present and Future of Biblical Theology, 1979 T&T C, pb, pp 162 £3.95
- Martin Hengel, The Atonement, The Origins of the Doctrine in the NT, 1981 pb pp112 £3.95
SCM Press
- Leander E Keck and J. Louis Martyn, Studies in Luke-Acts,
pb pp316 Fortress Press \$7.95 1980
- Reginald H. Fuller, The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives, 1980(2), pb pp225 \$5.95
Fortress Press
-

Scholars Press, Chico, CA, USA

- John Dominic Crossan, A Fragile Craft, The Work of Amos
Niven Wilder, 1981 pb pp81 \$7.50
- Bonnie Kittel, The Hymns of Qumran, 1981 pb pp222 \$13.50
- J.T. Forestell, Targumic Tradition and the NT, 1979 pb
pp137 \$12.00
- Jackson B. Herschbell, Pseudo-Plato, Axiochus, 1981 pb
pp90 \$13.50
- David John Lull, The Spirit in Galatia, Paul's interpretation of pneuma as divine power, 1980 pb
pp240 \$9.00
- G.W.E. Nickelsburg and John J. Collins, Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism, 1980 pb pp258 \$10.50
- Israel Yeivin, Introduction to the Tiberian Masorah, 1980
pb pp324 \$10.50 (Trans by E.J. Revell)
-